A DISCOURSE Concerning the IDOLATRY Practised in the CHURCH OF ROME,

AND

The hazard of *Salvation* in the Communion of it: in Answer to some Papers of a Revolted Protestant.

WHEREIN

A particular Account is given of the *Fanaticisms* and *Divisions* of that *Church*.

The Second Edition corrected.

By *Edward Stillingfleet*, D. D.
Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majestie.

London, Printed by *Robert White* for *Henry Mortlock* at the sign of the Phœnix in S. *Pauls* Church-yard, and at the White-Hart in *Westminster*-Hall. 1672.

ROME'S CHURCH IDOLATRY DISCOURSE

Tr. R.
S857DC

THE
PREFACE.

ALthough I see no great effect of the Courtship commonly used towards the Candid and Ingenuous Reader, *unless it be in diverting the censure from the Book to the Preface: yet in some case it looks like a breach of the* Readers *priviledge, not to give him an account of the occasion and design of a Book. Especially, when the matter handled therein, hath been thought to have been so throughly discussed before, and is of so general concernment, that every pretender thinks he knows as much already, as is to be known in it. Whereas nothing hath been more to the advantage of our Adversaries than this, that the things in dispute between us were generally no better understood, by the persons they have had their designs upon. For*

§ 1. The necessity of writing in these Controversies.

aſſoon as they *have baffled their ignorance and miſtakes*, theſe *have been ready to yield up themſelves and the* Cauſe, *imagining nothing more could be ſaid for it, than they could ſay for themſelves. Whereby our* Church *hath not only ſuffered in its reputation, as far as that is concerned in the weakneſs of ſome of its members; but ſtrange boaſts and triumphs have been made by thoſe of the* Church *of* Rome, *when ſuch who underſtood not their own* Religion *have embraced theirs. While theſe diſputes were freſh in the world, every one thought himſelf concerned to enquire into them; but ſince our* Church *hath been ſo long eſtabliſhed on the principles of the* Reformation, *and other unhappy controverſies have riſen up; the moſt have taken this Cauſe for granted, and thought it needleſs to enquire any farther into the Grounds of it.*

The preſent arts u'ed by our Adverſaries to gain Proſelytes

Which our Adverſaries perceiving, they have found far greater ſucceſs in their attempts upon particular perſons, than in publick Writings: for theſe have only provoked others to lay open the palpable weakneſs of their Cauſe, whereas in the other by their wayes of Addreſs, and all the arts of Inſinuation, they have inſtilled their principles into the minds of ſome leſs judicious perſons,

persons, before they were aware of it. Thence it is easie to observe that the greatest mischief they have done, hath been like the Pestilence, *by* walking in darkness, *and spreading their infection by whispers in corners. All their hopes and strength lye in the weakness and credulity of the persons they deal with; but if they meet with any who truly understand the differences between us, they soon give them over as untractable. But to such, whose employments have not given them leave to enquire, or whose capacity hath not been great enough to discern their* Sophistry, *their first work is, to make a false representation both of the Doctrines and practice of their* Church; *and if they be of such easie faith to believe them, they from thence perswade them into an ill opinion of their Teachers, who possessed them with so bad thoughts of such a* Church *as theirs. A* Church *of so great* Holiness (*as may be seen by the Saint-like lives of their Popes and Converts*) *a* Church *of so great* Antiquity (*hating only the Primitive times*) *a* Church *of so admirable* Unity (*saving the divisions in it*) *a* Church *so free from any* Fanatick heats (*as any one may believe that will.*) *If this first assault doth not make them yield, but they desire at least time to consider,*

consider, and advise in a matter of so great importance; then they tell them, there is not a man of our Church dares give any of them a meeting; if they offer to put it to a tryal, they will appoint a day which they foresee will be most inconvenient for the persons they are to meet with. If upon that account, it be declined or deferred, this is spread abroad for a Victory; if it be accepted then one thing or other happens that they cannot come; either the person goes out of Town unexpectedly, or his Superiours have forbidden him; or such conferences are not safe for them (they are so sorely persecuted) or at last, what good can an hours talk do to satisfie any one in matters of Religion? But if there be no remedy, which they are seldome without; and a conference happen, (which they scarce ever yield to, but when they have already gained the person for whose sake it is;) then whosoever was baffled, they are sure to go away with the triumph; and as an evidence of it, such a person went off from our Church upon it, when he was made sure of their side before. If this way takes not, then a Set of Questions is ready to be sent; if another be returned to them to be answered at the same time, this is declined, and complained of as hard dealing,

dealing, as though they had only the priviledge of putting Questions, and we the duty of answering them. If answers be given to them, after a Pass or two they put an end to the tryal of their skill in that place, and seek for another to shew it in. But if the Papers chance to be slighted, or busines hinders a present answer, or there be a reasonable presumption that the person concerned hath already forsaken our Church, *this becomes the occasion of a new triumph, the Papers are accounted unanswerable (as the* Spanish Armado *was called* invincible, *which we thank God we found to be otherwise) and it may be dre demanded again as Trophies, to be preserved for the glory of the* Catholick Cause.

All these several wayes I have had experience of in the compass of a few years, since by command I was publickly engaged in the Defence of so excellent a Cause, as that of our Church *against the* Church *of* Rome. *I confess it seemed somewhat hard to me, to be put to answer so many several Papers which I have received upon their tampering with particular persons of our* Church, *while my Book it self remained unanswered by them, after so many years of trying their strength about it. (For*

those two who in some small measure have attempted it, have performed it in the way that Rats answer Books, by gnawing some of the leaves; for the body and design of it remains wholly untouched by them.) But for the satisfaction of any person who desired it, I was not willing to decline any service, which tended to so good an end, as the preserving any member of our Church *in the communion of it: Which was the occasion of this present writing. For some time since, the Person concerned, after some discourses with her, brought me the two* Questions *mentioned in the beginning of the Book; to which I returned a speedy answer, in the midst of many other employments; not long after, I received the Reply; but hearing for a great while no further of the Person for whose sake this Discourse began, and having affairs more than enough, to take up my time, I laid aside the Papers, supposing that business at an end. But about* Christmas *last, they were called for by a near Friend of the Party concerned, and a personal Conference being declined, an intimation was given me, that the Papers were thought unanswerable. I began to fear so too, for at first I could not find them; but assoon as I did, I found the great*

im-

improvement they had made by lying ſo long, for what at firſt I looked on as inconſiderable, was in that time thought to be too ſtrong to be meddled with; and I could not tell what they might come to in time, if I let them alone any longer. And I was informed, by a worthy Perſon, that I. S. the man of confidence and principles, *had expreſſed great wonder I had not anſwered them; as though we had no cauſe to wonder that the* noble Science of Controverſie *ſhould be ſo abandoned by him, and that a man of ſuch mettal ſhould all this while leave his poor* Demonſtrations *alone to defend themſelves? Upon theſe ſuggeſtions I reſolved, as faſt as other imployments would give leave (for we are not thoſe happy men to have only one thing to mind) to give a full and punctual anſwer to them. Which I have now made publick, and printed the Papers themſelves at large, that my Adverſary may not complain of any injury done him by miſ-repreſenting his words or meaning. And beſides other reaſons, I the rather choſe to appear in publick, to draw them from their preſent way of* pickeering *and lying under hedges, to take advantage of ſome ſtragling members of our* Church, *not ſo able to defend themſelves; and*

whom they rather ſteal from us then conquer, being blinded with their ſmoke, more than overcome by any ſtrength of Argument. If they have any thing to ſay, either againſt our Church, or in Defence of their own, let them come into the open Field, from which they have of late ſo wiſely withdrawn themſelves, finding ſo little ſucceſs in it.

§. 4. Of the manner and deſign of the writing.

And ſince theſe Diſputes muſt be, I am very well pleaſed, that the Adverſary I have now to deal with, hath the Character of a Learned and Ingenuous man; and I do not deſire he ſhould loſe it, in the Debate between us; hoping that nothing ſhall proceed from me, but what likewiſe becomes a fair and ingenuous Adverſary. If I were not fully ſatisfied that we have truth and reaſon on our ſide, I ſhould never have been engaged in theſe combates; I am ſo great a friend to the peace of the Chriſtian world, that I could take more pleaſure in ending one Controverſie, than in being able to handle as many as the moſt Voluminous Schoolmen have ever done: For however Noble ſome may think, the Science of Controverſie to be, I am not fond of the practice of it; eſpecially, being managed with ſo much heat and paſſion, ſuch ſcorn and contempt of Adverſa-

ries, so many reproaches and personal reflections (as they commonly are) as if men forgot to be Christians, *when they began to be Disputants. I do not think it such a mighty matter to throw dirt in a mans face, and then to laugh at him, or (rather to take a Metaphor now from dry weather) to raise such a dust as may endanger the eye-sight of weaker persons. I think it no great skill to make things appear either ridiculous or dark, but to give them their due Colours, and set them in the clearest light shewes far more art and ingenuity. And even that smartness of expression, without which Controversie will hardly go down with many, seems but like the throwing Vinegar upon hot Coals, which gives a quick scent for the present, but vanishes immediately into smoke and air. In matters of Truth and Religion, Reason and evidence ought to sway men, and not passion and noise; and though men cannot command their judgements, they may and ought to do their expressions. And although this looks as like an Apologie for a dull Book as may be, yet I had much rather it should suffer for want of wit and smartness, than of good nature and* Christianity. *My design is to represent the matters in difference between us truly, to report faithfully,*

and to argue closely; and by these to shew, that no person can have any pretence of reason to leave our Church, *to embrace the communion of the* Church *of* Rome; *because the danger is so much greater there, in the* nature *of their* Worship *and* tendency *of their* doctrine; *and what they object most against us in point of* Fanaticism *and* divisions, *will equally hold against them; so that they have no advantages above us, but have many apparent dangers which we have not.*

§. 5. Of the charge of Idolatry against the Church of *Rome.*

Among the chiefest dangers in the communion of that Church, *I have insisted on that of* Idolatry; *not to make the breach wider than some others have done, but to let persons first understand the greatness of the danger before they run into it. I wish I could acquit them from so heavy a charge, but I cannot force my judgement: and while I think them guilty, it would be unfaithfulness in me, not to warn those of it, whom it most concerns to understand it. And where other things are subtle and nice, tedious and obscure, this lyes plain to the conscience of every man; if the* Church *of* Rome *be guilty of* Idolatry, *our separation can be no* Schism *either* before God *or* man, *because our communion would be a sin. And although it may be only an excess*

of

of charity, in some few learned persons, to excuse that Church *from* Idolatry, (*although not* all *who live in the communion of it:*) *yet upon the greatest search I can make, I think there is more of charity than judgement in so doing. For the proof of it, I must refer the Reader to the following Discourse. And that I may not be thought in so severe a censure to contradict the sense of our* Church, (*which I have so great a regard, to*) *I shall here shew, that this charge of* Idolatry *hath been managed against the* Church *of* Rome, *by the greatest and most learned defenders of it ever since the* Reformation.

What greater discovery can be made of the sense of our Church, than by the Book of Homilies, not barely allowed, but subscribed to as containing godly and wholsom doctrine, and necessary for these times? *and nothing can be more plainly delivered therein, than that the* Church *of* Rome *is condemned for* Idolatry. *So the third part of the* Sermon against the peril of Idolatry *concludes,* Ye have heard it evidently proved in these Homilies against Idolatry, by Gods Word, the Doctors of the Church, Ecclesiastical Histories, reason and experience, that Images have been and be worshipped, and so

Artic. 35.

Homil. part 2. *p.* 75.

Idolatry committed to them to the great offence of Gods Majesty, and danger of infinite souls, &c. *Who the Author of these* Homilies *was, is not material to enquire, since their authority depends not on the Writer, but the* Churches *approbation of them; but Dr.* Jackson *not only calls him* the worthy and learned Author of the Homilies concerning the peril of Idolatry, *but saith,* he takes him to be a Reverend Bishop of our Church: *and no wonder, since the most eminent* Bishops *in that time of Queen* Elizabeth, (*wherein these Homilies were added to the former*) *did all assert and maintain the same thing. As* Bishop Jewell *in his excellent* Defence *of the* Apology of the Church of *England,* and Answer to *Harding, wherein he proves,* that to give the honour of God to a creature, is manifest Idolatry, as the Papists do, *saith he,* in adoration of the Host, and the Worship of Images: *And his works ought to be looked on with a higher esteem than any other private person, being commanded to be placed in* Churches *to be read by the people. Of all persons of that* Age *none could be less suspected to be* Puritanically *inclined, than* Archbishop Whitgift; *yet in his* Learned Defence of the Church

Dr. Jackson Original of Unbelief, *Sect.* 4. *Ch.* 34.

Defence of the Apology, *Ch.* 7. *div.* 2. *p.* 551.

Answer to *Harding,* 8. *ar icl. p.* 283. *Art.* 14. *p.* 368. *p.* 382.

Church of *England* against *T.C. he makes good the same charge in these words*; I do as much mislike the distinction of the Papists, and the intent of it as any man doth, neither do I go about to excuse them from wicked, and without repentance and Gods singular mercy, damnable Idolatry. There are *saith he*, three kinds of Idolatry; one is, when the true God is worshipped by other means and wayes, than he hath prescribed, or would be worshipped, *i.e. against his expresi command, which is certainly his meaning*: the other is, when the true God is worshipped with false Gods: the third is, when we worship false Gods either in heart, mind, or in external creatures living or dead, and altogether forget the worship of the true God. All these three kinds are detestable, but the first is the least and the last is the worst. The Papists worship God otherwise than his will is, and otherwise than he hath prescribed, almost in all points of their worship; they also give to the creature, that which is due to the Creator, and sin against the first Table; yet are they not, for all that I can see or learn, in the third kind of Idolatry; and therefore if they repent un-

Defence of the Answer to the Admonition, *tr.* 8. *p* 152.

unfeignedly, they are not to be caſt either out of the Church, or out of the Miniſtry. The Papiſts have little cauſe to thank me, or fee me, for any thing I have ſpoken in their behalf as yet, you ſee that I place them among wicked and damnable Idolaters. *Thus far that Wiſe and Learned Biſhop. After him we may juſtly reckon* Biſhop Biſſon, *than whom none did more learnedly in that time defend the* perpetual Government of Chriſts Church by Biſhops, (*nor it may be ſince* :) *who in a ſet diſcourſe, at large proves the* Church *of* Rome *guilty of* Idolatry. 1. In the Worſhip of Images; the having of which, *he ſaith*, was never Catholick, and the worſhipping of them was ever wicked by the judgement of Chriſts Church: and that, the Worſhip even of the Image of Chriſts is Heatheniſm and Idolatry; and to Worſhip it makes it an Idol, and burning Incenſe to it is Idolatry, *which he there proves at large*; and that the Image of God made with hands, is a falſe God, and no likeneſs of his, but a lewd imagination of theirs, ſet up to feed their eyes with the contempt of his Sacred Will, diſhonour of his Holy Name, and open injury to his Divine Nature. 2. In the adoration of

Biſh. *Biſſon Diſp.* of Chriſtian ſubjection, *part.* 4. *p.* 319.

p. 321.

p. 324.

p. 530, *&c.*

of the Hoſt, *of which he treats at large. After theſe it will be leſs needful to produce the teſtimonies of* Dr. Fulk, Dr. Reynolds, Dr. Whitaker, *who all aſſerted and proved the* Church *of* Rome, *guilty of* Idolatry: *and I cannot find one perſon, who owned himſelf to be of the* Church *of* England, *in all* Queen Elizabeths *reign, who did make any doubt of it. Let us now come, to the reign of* King James. *And here in the firſt place we ought to ſet down the judgement of that* Learned Prince *himſelf, who ſo throughly underſtood the matters in controverſie between us and the* Church of Rome, *as appears by his* Premonition *to all* Chriſtian Princes; *wherein after ſpeaking of other points, he comes to* that of Reliques of Saints: But for the worſhipping of either of them or Images, I muſt, *ſaith he*, account it damnable Idolatry; *and after addes*, that the Scriptures are ſo directly, vehemently, and punctually againſt it, as I wonder what brain of man, or ſuggeſtion of Satan durſt offer it to Chriſtians: and all muſt be ſalved with nice and philoſophical diſtinctions—— Let them therefore that maintain this doctrine, anſwer it to Chriſt at the latter day, when he ſhall accuſe them of Idolatry:

Dr. *Fulks* confutation of an Idolotrous Treatiſe of *Nicol. Sanders.*
Dr. Reynolds de Idolat. Eccleſ. Rom.
Dr. Whitaker, c. Duræum, l. 5. p. 133.
K. *James* his works *p.* 303.

latry: and then I doubt if he will be paid with such nice Sophistical distinctions. *And when* Isaac Casaubon *was employed by him to deliver his opinion to* Cardinal Perron, *mentioning the practices of the* Church *of* Rome *in* invocation of Saints, *he saith*, that the Church of *England* did affirm, that those practices were joyned with great impiety. Bishop Andrews, *whom no man suspects of want of learning, or not understanding the doctrine of our* Church, *was also employed to answer* Cardinal Bellarmin *who had writ against the* King: *and doth he decline charging the* Church *of* Rome *with* Idolatry? *No, so far from it, that he not only in plain terms charges them with it, but saith*, that *Bellarmin* runs into Heresie, nay, into madness to defend it: *and in his answer to* Perron *he saith*, it is most evident, by their Breviaries, Hours, and Rosaries, that they pray directly, absolutely and finally to Saints; and not meerly to the Saints, to pray to God for them, but to give what they pray for themselves. *In the same time of* King James, Bishop Abbot *writ his* Answer *to* Bishop; *in which he saith*, that the Church of *Rome* by the Worship of Images, hath matched all the Idolatries of

Is. Casaub. Ep. ad Cardin. Perron, ad quartam Instant.

Ad Tomi librum responsi p. 312. Answer to Perron 20. chap. p. 58.

Bish. Abbot against Bishop, Tom. 2. p. 1105.

of the Heathens, and brought all their jugling devices into the Church, abusing the ignorance and simplicity of the people as grosly and damnably as ever they did. *Towards the latter end of his* Reign *came forth* Bishop Whites Reply to Fisher, *and he calls* the worshipping of Images, a Superstitious dotage, a palliate Idolatry, a remainder of Paganism, condemned by Sacred Scripture, censured by Primitive Fathers, and a Seminary of direful contention and mischief in the Church of Christ. *Dr.* Field *chargeth the* Invocation *of* Saints with such Superstition and Idolatry as cannot be excused. We charge the adherents of the Church of *Rome* with gros Idolatry, (*saith* Bishop Usher *in his* Sermon *preached before the* Commons A. D. 1620.) because that contrary to Gods express Commandment they are found to be worshippers of Images. Neither will it avail them here to say, that the Idolatry forbidden in the Scripture is that only which was used by the Jews and Pagans: For as well might one plead, that Jewish or Heathen fornication was here only reprehended, as Jewish or Heathenish Idolatry. But as the one is a foul sin, whether it be committed by

White's Reply to *Fisher*, p. 209.

Dr. *Field* of the Church, l. 3. ch 20. p. 109.

Bish. *Ushers* Sermon before the Commons, p. 30.

by Jew, Pagan or Christian: so, if such as profess the Name of Christ shall practise that which the Word of God condemneth in Jews or Pagans for Idolatry, their profession is so far from diminishing, that it augmenteth rather the hainousness of the crime. *About the same time came forth* Bishop Downams *Book of* Anti-christ, *wherein he doth at large prove*, That to give divine honour to a creature, is Idolatry; and that the Papists do give it in the Worship of Saints, the Host and Images: *which is likewise done, nearer our own times, by* Bishop Davenant, *and Dr.* Jackson.

Downam de Antichristo. l. 5. c. 1, 2. &c. Davenant. deter. quæst. 18. D. Jacksons Original of Unbelief, sect. 4.

I shall conclude all (although I might produce more) with the testimony of Archbishop Laud, *who in his* Conference, *saith*, the ancient Church knew not the adoration of Images; and the modern Church of *Rome* is too like to Paganism in the practice of it, and driven to scarce intelligible subtilties in her Servants writings that defend it; and this without any care had of millions of Souls unable to understand her subtilties, or shun her practice: *and in his Marginal Notes upon* Bellarmin (*written with his own hand, now in my possession*) *where* Bellarmin *answers the testimony of the*

Archbish. *Lauds* Conferen. *p.* 277.

Bell. de Sanct. beat. l. 1. c. 20.

the Council *of* Laodicea *againſt the* worſhip *of* Angels, *by ſaying*, That it doth not condemn all Worſhip of Angels, but only that which is proper to God; *he replies*, That *Theodoret* who produced that teſtimony of the Council, expreſly mentions the praying to Angels; therefore, *ſaith he*, the praying to them was that Idolatry which the Council condemns. *By this we ſee, that the moſt Eminent and Learned Defenders of our Church, of greateſt authority in it, and zeal for the Cauſe of it againſt enemies of all ſorts, have agreed in the charge of* Idolatry *againſt the* Church *of* Rome.

And I cannot ſee why the authority of ſome very few perſons, *though of great Learning, ſhould bear ſway againſt the conſtant opinion of our* Church *ever ſince the* Reformation. *Since our* Church *is not now to be formed according to the* ſingular Fancies *of ſome few* (*though Learned men*;) *much leſs to be modelled by the* Caprichio's *of* Superſtitious Fanaticks, *who prefer ſome odd opinions and ways of their own, before the received doctrine and practice of the* Church *they live in. Such as theſe, we rather pity their weakneſs, than regard their cenſures; and are only ſorry when our* Adverſaries *make ſuch* pro-

properties *of them, as by their means to beget in ſome a diſaffection to our* Church. *Which I am ſo far from (whatever malice and peeviſhneſs may ſuggeſt to the contrary) that upon the greateſt enquiry I can make, I eſteem it the beſt* Church *of the* Chriſtian world; *and think my time very well imployed (what ever* thanks *I meet with for it) in defending its* Cauſe, *and preſerving perſons in the communion of it.*

THE

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

Of the Idolatry practiſed in the Church of Rome, *in the Worſhip of Images.*

THE *introduction, concerning the occaſion of the debate. The Church of* Rome *makes its members guilty of Hypocriſie or Idolatry: Firſt, Of the Worſhip of God by Images: Some propoſitions for clearing the notion of Divine Worſhip. It is in Gods power to determine the way of his Worſhip, which being determined, Gods Law, and not our intention, is to be the rule of Worſhip. The main queſtion is, Whether God hath forbidden the worſhipping of himſelf by an Image, under the notion of Idolatry? Of the meaning of the ſecond Commandment, from the* terms *therein uſed; the large ſenſe and impor-*

tance of them, which cannot be understood only of Heathen Idols. Of the reason of that Law, from Gods infinite and invisible nature: How far that hath been acknowledged by Heathens? The Law against Image Worship no ceremonial Law, respecting meerly the Jews; the reason against it made more clear by the Gospel: The wiser Heathen did not worship their Images as Gods, yet their worship condemned as Idolatry. The Christian Church believed the reason of this Law to be immutable; Of the Doctrine of the second Council of Nice; *the opposition to it in* Greece, Germany, France *and* England. *Of the Scripture Instances of Idolatry contrary to the second Commandment, in the Golden Calf, and the Calves of* Dan *and* Bethel. *Of the distinctions used to excuse image-worship from being Idolatry: The vanity and folly of them. The instances supposed to be parallel answered.*

P. 43.

CHAP. II.

Of their Idolatry in Adoration of the Host, and Invocation of Saints.

The Argument proposed, concerning the Adoration of the Host; the insufficiency of the Answer to it manifested: supposing equal revelation for Transubstantiation as for Christs Divinity, yet not the same reason for Worshipping the Host as the person of Christ; the great disparity between these two at large discovered; the Controversie truly

truly ſtated, concerning Adoration of the Hoſt: and it is proved, that no man, on the principles of the Roman Church, can be ſecure he doth not commit Idolatry in it. The confeſſion of our Adverſaries, that the ſame Principles will juſtifie the Worſhip of any Creature. No ſuch motives to believe Tranſubſtantiation as the Divinity of Chriſt. Biſhop Taylor's *Teſtimony anſwered by himſelf. To Worſhip Chriſt in the Sun, as lawful as to Worſhip him in the Hoſt. The groſſeſt Idolatry excuſable, on the ſame grounds. The argument propoſed and vindicated, concerning the Invocation of Saints practiſed in the Church of* Rome. *The Fathers Arguments againſt the Heathens, hold againſt Invocation of Saints; the ſtate of the Controverſie, about Idolatry, as managed by them. They make it wholly unlawful, to give divine Worſhip to any Creature, how excellent ſoever. The Worſhip, not only of Heathen Gods, but of Angels condemned. The common evaſions anſwered. Prayer more proper to God, than Sacrifice. No ſuch diſparity as is pretended, between the manner of Invocating Saints, and the Heathens Invocating their Deities. In the Church of* Rome, *they do more than pray to Saints to pray for them, proved from the preſent moſt Authentick Breviaries. Suppoſing that were all, it would not excuſe them. St.* Auſtin *no friend to Invocation of Saints. Practices condemned by the Church pleaded for it. Of Negative points being Articles of faith.* p. 95.

CHAP. III.

Of the hindrances of a good Life, and of Devotion in the Roman *Church.*

The Doctrines of the Roman *Church prejudicial to Piety. The Sacrament of Penance, as taught among them, destroys the necessity of a good life. The Doctrine of Purgatory takes away the care of it; as appears by the true stating it, and comparing that Doctrine with Protestants. How easie it is, according to them, for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. Purgatory dreadful to none but poor and friendless. Sincerity of devotion hindred, by prayers in an unknown Tongue. The great absurdity of it manifested. The effects of our Ancestors devotion had been as great, if they had said their prayers in English. The language of prayer proved to be no indifferent thing, from S.* Pauls *arguments. No universal consent for prayers in an unknown tongue, by the confession of their own Writers. Of their doctrine of the efficacy of Sacraments, that it takes away all necessity of devotion, in the minds of the receivers. This complained of by* Cassander *and* Arnaud; *but proved against them, to be the doctrine of the* Roman *Church, by the Canons of the Council of* Trent. *The great easiness of getting Grace by their Sacraments. Of their discouraging the*

the reading the Scriptures. A ſtanding rule of devotion neceſſary. None ſo fit to give it, as God himſelf: This done by him in the Scriptures. All perſons therefore concerned to read them. The Arguments againſt reading the Scriptures, would have held againſt the publiſhing them in a language known to the people. The dangers as great then, as ever have been ſince. The greateſt prudence of the Roman *Church is wholly to forbid the the Scriptures; being acknowledged by their wiſeſt men, to be ſo contrary to their Intereſt. The confeſſion of the Cardinals at* Bononia, *to that purpoſe. The avowed practice of the* Roman *Church herein, directly contrary to that of the Primitive: although the reaſons were as great then, from the danger of Hereſies. This confeſſed by their own Writers.* p. 55.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Fanaticiſm of the Roman *Church.*

The unreaſonableneſs of objecting Sects and Fanaticiſms to us, as the effects of reading the Scriptures. Fanaticiſm countenanced in the Roman *Church, but condemned by ours. Private revelations made among them the grounds of believing ſome points of doctrine; proved from their own Authors. Of the Revelations pleaded for the immaculate Conception. The*

Revelations of S. Brigitt *and S.* Catharin *directly contrary in this point, yet both owned in the Church of* Rome. *The large approbations of S.* Brigitts, *by Popes and Councils; and both their revelations acknowledged to be divine, in the leſſons read upon their dayes. S.* Catharines *wonderful faculty of ſmelling ſouls, a gift peculiar to her and* Philip Nerius. *The vain attempts of reconciling thoſe Revelations. The great number of female Revelations approved in the* Roman *Church. Purgatory, Tranſubſtantiation, Auricular Confeſſion proved by Viſions and Revelations. Feſtivals appointed upon the credit of Revelations: the Feaſt of* Corpus Chriſti *on the Revelation made to* Juliana, *the Story of it related from their own Writers: No ſuch things can be objected to our Church. Revelations ſtill owned by them; proved from the Fanatick Revelations of Mother* Juliana *very lately publiſhed by Mr.* Creſſy: *Some inſtances of the blaſphemous Non-ſenſe contained in them. The Monaſtick Orders founded in Enthuſiaſm. An account of the great Fanaticiſm of S.* Benedict, *and S.* Romoaldus: *their hatred of Humane Learning, and ſtrange Viſions and Revelations. The Carthuſian Order founded upon a Viſion. The Carmelites Viſion of their habit. The Franciſcan and Dominican Orders founded on Fanaticiſm, and ſeen in a Viſion of* Innocent *the third to be the great ſupporters of the* Roman *Church. The* Quakeriſm *of S.* Francis *deſcribed from their beſt Authors. His Ignorance, Extaſies and Fanatick Preaching.*

The

The Vision of Dominicus. *The blasphemous Enthusiasm of the Mendicant Fryers. The History of it related at large. Of the* Evangelium æternum, *and the blasphemies contained in it. The Author of it supposed to be the General of the Franciscan Order, however owned by the Fryers, and read and preached at* Paris. *The opposition to it by the University: but favoured by the* Popes. Gul. S. Amour *writing against it, his Book publickly burnt, by order of the* Court *of* Rome. *The* Popes *horrible partiality to the Fryers. The Fanaticism of the Franciscans afterwards. Of the followers of* Petrus Johannis de Oliva. *The Spiritual State began (say they) from S.* Francis. *The story of his wounds, and* Maria Visitationis *parallel'd. The canting language used by the Spiritual Brethren, called* Beguini, Fraticelli, *and* Begardi. *Of their doctrines about Poverty, Swearing Perfection, the Carnal Church and Inspiration: by all which, they appear to be a Sect of Quakers, after the Order of S.* Francis. *Of the Schism made by them. The large spreading, and long continuance of them. Of the* Apostolici *and* Dulciniſtæ. *Of their numerous Conventicles. Their high opinion of themselves. Their zeal against the Clergy, and Tythes; their doctrine of Christian Liberty. Of the* Alumbrado's *in* Spain: *their disobedience to Bishops; obstinate adhering to their own fancies, calling them Inspirations; their being above Ordinances.* Ignatius Loyola *suspected to be one of the* Illuminati, *proved from* Melchior

Canus. *The Jesuits Order founded in Fanaticism; a particular account of the Romantick Enthusiasm of* Ignatius, *from the Writers of his own Order. Whereby it is proved, that he was the greatest pretender to Enthusiasm, since the days of* Mahomet *and S.* Francis. Ignatius *gave no respect to men by words, or putting off his Hat; his great Ignorance and Preaching in the Streets: his glorying in his sufferings for it; his pretence to Mortification; the ways he used to get disciples. Their way of resolution of difficulties by seeking God; their itinerant preaching in the Cities of* Italy. *The Sect of Quakers a new Order of Disciples of* Ignatius, *only wanting Confirmation from the Pope, which* Ignatius *obtained. Of the Fanatick way of devotion in the* Roman *Church. Of Superstitions and Enthusiastical Fanaticism among them. Of their mystical Divinity. Mr.* Cressy's *canting in his Preface to* Sancta Sophia. *Of the the Deiform fund of the soul; a supereſſential life, and the way to it. Of contemplating with the will. Of passive Unions. The method of Self-annihilation. Of the Union of nothing with nothing. Of the feeling of not-being. The mischief of an unintelligible way of devotion. The utmost effect of this way is gross Enthusiasm. Mr.* Cressy's *Vindication of it examined. The last sort of Fanaticism among them, resisting authority under pretence of Religion. Their principles and practices compared with the Fanaticks. How far they are disowned at present by them. Of the Vindicati-*

on

on of the Iriſh Remonſtrance. *The Court of* Rome *hath always favoured that party, which is moſt deſtructive to Civil Government, proved by particular and late Inſtances.* p. 204.

CHAP. V.

Of the Diviſions of the Roman Church.

The great pretence of Unity in the Church *of* Rome *conſidered. The* Popes *Authority the fountain of that Unity; what that Authority is which is challenged by the* Popes *over the* Chriſtian *World; the diſturbances which have happened therein, on the account of it. The firſt revolt of* Rome *from the Empire, cauſed by the* Popes; Baronius *his Arguments anſwered. Rebellion the foundation of the greatneſs of that* Church. *The cauſe of the ſtrict League between the* Popes *and the poſterity of* Charles Martel. *The diſturbances made by* Popes, *in the new Empire: Of the quarrels of* Greg. 7. *with the Emperor and other Chriſtian Princes, upon the pretence of the* Popes *Authority. More diſturbances on that account in Chriſtendom, than upon any other matter of Religion. Of the Schiſms which have happened in the* Roman *Church: particularly thoſe after the time of* Formoſus, *wherein his Ordinations were nulled by his Succeſſors; the Popes oppoſition to each other in that Age:*

Age: *the miſerable ſtate of that Church then deſcribed. Of the* Schiſms *of latter times, by the* Italick *and* Gallick *factions*; *the long continuance of them. The miſchief of thoſe* Schiſms, *on their own principles. Of the diviſions in that Church, about the matters of Order and Government. The differences between the Biſhops and the Monaſtick Orders, about exemptions and priviledges*; *the hiſtory of that Controverſie, and the bad ſucceſs the* Popes *had in attempting to compoſe it. Of the quarrel between the* Regulars *and* Seculars *in* England. *The continuance of that Controverſie here, and in* France. *The* Jeſuits *enmity to the Epiſcopal Order and Juriſdiction*: *the hard caſe of the* Biſhop *of* Angelopolis *in* America. *The Popes ſtill favour the* Regulars, *as much as they dare. The* Jeſuits *way of converting the* Chineſe, *diſcovered by that* Biſhop. *Of the differences in matter of Doctrines, in that* Church. *They have no better way to compoſe them, than we. The* Popes *Authority never truly ended one Controverſie among them. Their ways to evade the deciſions of Popes and Councils. Their diſſenſions are about matters of faith. The ways taken to excuſe their own differences will as well take away thoſe between them and us, manifeſted by* Sancta Clara's *Expoſition of the* 39 *Articles. Their diſputes not confined to their* Schools, *proved, by a particular inſtance, about the immaculate conception*; *the infinite ſcandals, confeſſed by their own Authors, to have been in their Church about it.*

From

From all which it appears, that the Church *of* Rome *can have no advantage, in point of Unity, above ours.* p. 309.

CHAP. VI.

An Answer to the Remainder of the Reply.

The mis-interpreting Scripture doth not hinder its being a rule of faith. Of the superstitious observations of the Roman Church. Of Indulgences; the practice of them, in what time begun; on what occasion, and in what terms granted. Of the Indulgences in Jubilees, in the Churches at Rome, *and upon saying some Prayers. Instances of them produced. What opinion hath been had of Indulgences, in the Church of* Rome: *some confess they have no foundation in Scripture, or Antiquity; others that they are pious frauds: the miserable shifts the defenders of indulgences were put to: plain evidences of their fraud from the Disputes of the Schools about them. The treasure of the Church invented by* Aquinas, *and on what occasion. The wickedness of men increased by* Indulgences, *acknowledged by their own Writers: and therefore condemned, by many of that Church. Of* Bellarmins *prudent Christians opinion of them. Indulgences no meer relaxations of Canonical Penance. The great absurdity of the doctrine of the Churches Treasure, on which Indulgences are founded,*

founded, at large manifested. The tendency of them to destroy devotion, proved by experience; and the nature of the Doctrine. Of Communion in one kind; no devotion in opposing an Institution of Christ. Of the Popes power of dispensing contrary to the Law of God, in Oaths and Marriages. The ill consequence of asserting Marriage in a Priest to be worse than Fornication, which is done in the Church of Rome. *Of the uncertainty of faith therein. How far revelation to be believed against sense. The arguments to prove the uncertainty of their faith defended. The case of a revolter and a bred Papist compared, as to salvation: and the greater danger of one than the other proved. The motives of the Roman Church considered; those laid down by* Bishop Taylor, *fully answered by himself. An account of the faith of Protestants, laid down in the way of Principles: wherein the grounds and nature of our certainty of faith are cleared. And from the whole concluded, that there can be no reasonable cause to forsake the communion of the Church of* England, *and to embrace that of the Church of* Rome.

p. 314.

Two

Two *Queſtions* propoſed by one of the Church of *Rome*.

1. *WHether a* Proteſtant *having the ſame Motives to become a* Catholick, *which one bred and born, and well grounded in the* Catholick Religion, *hath to remain in it, may not equally be ſaved in the profeſſion of it?*

2. *Whether it be ſufficient to be a* Chriſtian *in the* abſtract, *or in the* whole latitude; *or there be a neceſſity of being a member of ſome diſtinct* Church, *or Congregation of* Chriſtians?

An-

Answer.

THE first *Question* being supposed to be put concerning a *Protestant* yet continuing so, doth imply a contradiction, *viz.* That a *Protestant* continuing so, should have the same Motives to become a *Catholick* (taking that *term* here only as signifying one of the communion of the *Church* of *Rome*) which those have, who have been born or bred in that communion. But supposing the meaning of the Question to be this, Whether a *Protestant* leaving the communion of our *Church*, upon the Motives used by those of the *Roman Church*, may not be equally saved with those who are bred in it? I answer,

1. That an equal capacity of salvation of those persons being supposed, can be no argument to leave the communion of a Church, wherein salvation of a person may be much more safe, than of either of them: No more, than it is, for a man to leap from the plain ground into a Ship, that is in danger of being wrackt, because he may equally hope to be saved with those who are in it. Nay, supposing an equal capacity of salvation in two several *Churches*, there

there can be no reason to forsake the communion of the one for the other. So that to perswade any one to leave our *Church* to embrace that of *Rome*, it is by no means sufficient to ask, whether such a one may not as well be saved as they that are in it already: but it is necessary, that they prove, that it is of necessity to salvation to leave our Church, and become a member of theirs: And when they do this, I intend to be one of their number.

2. We assert, that all those, who are in the communion of the *Church* of *Rome*, do run so great a hazard of their salvation, that none who have a care of their souls, ought to embrace it, or continue in it. And that upon these grounds.

1. *Because they must by the terms of communion with that Church, be guilty either of Hypocrisie or Idolatry*; either of which are sins inconsistent with salvation. Which I thus prove.

That *Church* which requires the giving the *Creature* the Worship due only to the *Creator*, makes the members of it guilty of Hypocrisie or Idolatry: For if they do it, they are guilty of the latter; if they do it not, of the former: But the *Church of* Rome *in the Worship of God by Images, the Adoration of the Bread in the Eucharist, and the formal Invocation of Saints*, doth require the giving to the Creature the Worship due only to the Creator: Therefore it makes the members of it guilty of Hypocrisie or Idolatry.

That the *Church* of *Rome*, in these particulars, doth require the giving the Creature the honor

honor due only to *God*, I prove thus concerning each of them.

1. Where the Worship of *God* is terminated upon a creature, there, by their own confession, the Worship due only to *God* is given to the creature; but *in the Worship of God by Images*, the Worship due to God is terminated wholly on the creature; which is thus proved; the Worship which *God* himself denies to receive, must be terminated on the creature: but God himself, in the *Second Commandment*, not only denies to receive it, but threatens severely to punish them that give it. Therefore it cannot be terminated on *God*, but only on the Image.

2. The same Argument which would make the grossest Heathen Idolatry Lawful, cannot excuse any act from *Idolatry*; but the same Argument, whereby the *Papists* make the Worship of the Bread in the *Eucharist* not to be Idolatry, would make the grossest Heathen *Idolatry* not to be so. For if it be not therefore *Idolatry*, because they suppose the bread to be *God*, then the Worship of the Sun was not *Idolatry* in them who supposed the Sun to be *God*; and upon this ground, the grosser the *Idolatry* was, the less it was *Idolatry*: for the grossest *Idolaters* were those, who supposed their *Statues* to be *Gods*. And upon this ground their Worship was more lawful, than of those, who supposed them not to be so.

3. If the supposition of a middle excellency between *God* and *us*, be a sufficient ground for *formal Invocation*, then the Heathen Worship of

of their inferiour *Deities* could be no *Idolatry*: for the Heathens still pretended, that they did not give to them the Worship proper to their Supream God; which is as much as is pretended by the devoutest *Papist*, in justification of their *Invocation of Saints*. To these I expect a direct and punctual answer, professing as much Charity towards them, as is consistent with Scripture and Reason.

2. *Because the Church of* Rome *is guilty of so great corruption of the Christian Religion by such opinions and practices which are very apt to hinder a good life*: Such are, *the* destroying the necessity of a good life, *by making the Sacrament of Penance joyned with contrition, sufficient for salvation*; the taking off the care of it, *by supposing an expiation of sin (by the prayers of the living) after death*. And the sincerity of devotion is much obstructed in it, *by prayers in a language which many understand not*; *by making the efficacy of Sacraments depend upon the bare administration, whether our minds be prepared for them or not*; *by discouraging the reading the Scripture, which is our most certain rule of faith and life*; *by the multitude of superstitious observations, never used in the Primitive Church, as we are ready to defend*; *by the gross abuse of people in Pardons and Indulgences*; *by denying the Cup to the Laity, contrary to the practice of the Church in the solemn Celebration of the Eucharist, for a thousand years after Christ*; *by making it in the power of any person to dispense, contrary to the Law of God, in Oathes and Marriages*; *by making disobedience to*

the Church, in disputable matters, more hainous than disobedience to the Laws of Christ, in unquestionable things; as Marriage in a Priest, to be a greater crime, than Fornication.

By all which practices, and opinions we assert, that there are so many hinderances to a good life, that none who have a care of their salvation, can venture their souls, in the communion of such a *Church*, which either enjoyns or publickly allows them.

3. *Because it exposeth the faith of Christians, to so great uncertainty:* By *making the authority of the Scriptures to depend on the infallibility of the Church, when the Churches Infallibility must be proved by the Scripture:* by *making those things necessary to be believed, which if they be believed overthrow all foundations of faith, viz.* That we are not to believe our senses, in the plainest objects of them; as, that bread which we see is not bread; upon which it follows, that tradition being a continued kind of sensation, can be no more certain, than sense it self; and that the Apostles might have been deceived in the body of *Christ* after the resurrection; and the *Church* of any Age, in what they saw or heard. By *denying to men the use of their judgement and reason, as to the matters of faith proposed by a Church*, when they must use it in the choice of a *Church*; by *making the Churches power extend to make new Articles of faith,*

viz.

viz. by making thoſe things neceſſary to be believed, which were not ſo before. By *pretending to infallibility, in determining Controverſies; and yet not determining Controverſies, which are on foot among themſelves.* All which, and ſeveral other things, which my deſigned brevity will not permit me to mention, tend very much to ſhake the faith of ſuch, who have nothing elſe to rely on, but the authority of the *Church of Rome.*

3. I anſwer, *That a Proteſtant leaving the Communion of our Church, doth incurr a greater guilt, than one who was bred up in the communion of the Church of* Rome, *and continues therein by invincible ignorance*; and therefore cannot equally be ſaved with ſuch a one. For a *Proteſtant* is ſuppoſed, to have ſufficient convictions of the Errours of the *Roman Church*, or is guilty of wilful ignorance, if he hath not; but although we know not, what allowances God will make for invincible ignorance, we are ſure that wilful ignorance, or chooſing a worſe Church before a better, is a damnable ſin, and unrepented of deſtroyes ſalvation.

To the ſecond *Queſtion* I anſwer, 1. I do not underſtand what is meant by a *Chriſtian in the Abſtract, or in the whole latitude*; it being a thing I never heard, or read of before: and therefore may have ſome meaning in it, which I cannot underſtand. 2. But if the Queſtion be, as the

last words imply it, whether a *Christian* by vertue of his being so, be bound to joyn in some *Church* or *Congregation* of *Christians*? I answer affirmatively; and that he is bound to choose the communion of the purest *Church*, and not to leave that for a corrupt one, though called never so *Catholick*.

The

The Proposer's of the Questions Reply to the Answer.

Madam,

I Did not expect that two bare Questions could have produced such a super-fœtation of Controversies, as the Paper you sent me is fraught with; But since the Answerer hath been pleased to take this Method, (for what end himself best knows) I shall not refuse to give a fair and plain return, to the several points he insists upon, and that with as much brevity, as the matter and circumstances will bear.

The Questions proposed were: 1. Whether a Protestant having the same Motives to become a Catholick, which one bred and born, and well grounded in Catholick Religion hath to remain in it, may not equally be saved in the profession of it?

The 2. Whether it be sufficient to be a Christian in the abstract, or in the whole latitude, or there be a necessity of being a member of some distinct Church or Congregation of Christians?

The first, *he saith*, being supposed to be put concerning a Protestant continuing so, implyes a contradiction; *but where it lyes I cannot see; for a Protestant may have the same Motives, and*

yet out of wilfulness or passion not acquiesce to them. He saw no doubt this supposition to be impertinent to the Question, and therefore in the second part of the 1. §. states it thus: Whether a Protestant leaving the communion of the Protestant Church, upon the motives used by those of the Roman Church, may not be equally saved with those who were bred in it.

The Question thus stated, in its true supposition, he answers first, §. 2. That an equal capacity of salvation of those persons being supposed, can be no argument to leave the Communion of a Church, wherein the salvation of a person may be much more safe than either of them. But before I reply, I must do both him and myself right in matter of fact; and it is, Madam, that when you first addressed to me, you professed your self much troubled, that he had told you, a person leaving the Protestant communion, and embracing the Catholick, could not be saved. That we should deny salvation to any out of the Catholick Church, you lookt upon as uncharitable, and this assertion of his had startled you in the opinion you had before of the Protestant Charity. Whereupon you desired to know my opinion in the case, and I told you I saw no reason, why the same Motives which secured one born and bred, and well grounded in Catholick Religion, to continue in it, were not sufficient also to secure a Protestant, who convinced by them, should embrace it. This, Madam, your self can witness, was the true occasion of your proposing the Question, and not as the Answerer supposes, that I used the meer question it self as a sufficient Argument

gument to perswade you to embrace the Catholick Communion. This premised, I reply; that the Answer he gives, is altogether forraign to the matter in hand, the Controversie not being between a Bred and a Converted Catholick on the one side, and a person supposed to be in a safer Church than either of them on the other: nor yet between two several Churches, supposed to have in them an equal Capacity of Salvation; but between a person bred in the Catholick Religion on the one side, and another converted to it from Protestantism on the other, whether the latter may not be equally saved with the former? Nor is it to the purpose of the present Question, to prove that it is of necessity to salvation to leave the Prostetant Church, and become a member of the Catholick; *because the Question is only of the possibility, not of the necessity of Salvation. I say, it is not necessary, to the present Question, to prove this; but rather belongs to the second, where I shall speak to it. Whether there be a necessity of being a member of some distinct Church? Which being resolved affirmatively by both parts, it follows then in order to enquire which this true Church is. As for the Example of* a man leaping from the plain ground into a Ship that is in danger of being wrackt, *meaning by that Ship (as I suppose he does) the Catholick Church. Some will be apt to think he had come nearer the Mark if he had compared the Protestant to a Ship, which by often knocking against the Rock on which the Catholick Church is built, had split it self into innumerable Sects, and was now in danger of sinking: his comparison was*

grounded only on his own ſuppoſition, but this is grounded on the truth it ſelf of too ſad an experience. But to leave words, and come to the matter. His ſecond Anſwer is, §. 3. *that* all thoſe, who are in the communion of the Church of *Rome*, do run ſo great a hazard of their Salvation, that none who have a care of their ſouls ought to embrace or continue in it. *The firſt anſwer, as I have ſhewed, was nothing pertinent to the preſent Queſtion; nor comes this ſecond, any nearer the matter; for though it be ſuppoſed, that none ought to embrace or continue in the Catholick Church, by reaſon of the great hazard, he ſaith, they run of their ſalvation; yet if they do embrace or continue in it, why may they not be equally ſaved, that is, with equal capacity? but this aſſertion, however beſide the Queſtion, he makes it his main buſineſs to prove, firſt,* §. 4. Becauſe thoſe who embrace, or continue in the Catholick Church, are guilty either of Hypocriſie, or Idolatry; either of which, are ſins inconſiſtent with ſalvation. *And here he muſt give me leave to return upon him a more palpable contradiction, than that he ſuppoſed to have found in the Queſtion,* viz. *to aſſert only, that thoſe of the Catholick Communion run a great hazard of their ſalvation, and yet affirm at the ſame time that they are guilty either of Hypocriſie, or Idolatry, ſins inconſiſtent with Salvation: which reduced into plain terms is no other, but that they may be ſaved, though hardly; and yet cannot be ſaved. But to the Argument;* The Church of *Rome*, by the Worſhip of God by Images, by the adoration of Bread in the Euchariſt, and

and the formal invocation of Saints, doth require the giving to the Creature the Worship due only to the Creator; Therefore it makes the members of it guilty of Hypocrisie or Idolatry. *The charge is great, but what are the proofs?*

Concerning the first he saith, §. 5. that in the Worship of God by Images, the Worship due to God is terminated wholly on the Creature. *And surely this implies another contradiction, that it should be the Worship of God by Images, and yet be terminated wholly on the Creature*; *Nevertheless he proves it thus*; The Worship which God himself denyes to receive, must be terminated upon the Creature; but God himself in the second Commandment, not only denyes to receive it, but threatens severely to punish them that give it, *that is, that Worship him by an Image*: Therefore it connot be terminated on God, but only on the Image. *To this Argument, which to be just to the Author, I confess I have not seen any where proposed in these terms, I answer, the first Proposition is built on a great mistake of the Nature of humane acts, which though they ought to be governed by the Law of God, yet when they swerve from it, cease not to tend to their own proper objects. Gods prohibition of such or such a kind of Worship, may make it to be unlawful, but hinders not the act from tending, whither it is intended; and consequently if it be intended or directed by the understanding to God, though after an unlawful manner, it will not fail to be terminated upon God: Thus, when a Thief or a Murderer prayes to God, to give him good success in the Theft or Murder he intends; though God*

denyes

denyes to hear any such Prayer, yet is the Prayer truly directed to him: and thus when the Jews offered to God in Sacrifice the blind and the lame, though he had forbidden it, yet was the oblation terminated on him, and therefore he reproves them for having polluted him, Mal. 1. 8. *and to convince them the more of their evil doings, offer it now, sayes he, to thy Governour, will he be pleased with thee, or accept thy person? Though the Governour deny to accept what is presented to him, yet it is truly offered to him by the presenter: and so, although God deny to accept such or such Sacrifice, yet it is truly offered to him; though the offering of it, after a forbidden manner, make it to be sin: Did not God refuse to accept the Sacrifice of* Cain, *and yet the Scripture,* Gen. 4. 3. *sayes expresly, that he brought an offering to the Lord? God had not respect to* Cain *nor his offering, but this did not hinder, but that* Cains *offering had respect to God, and was terminated on him. In like manner, though God deny such or such a kind of Worship; if it be offered, though unlawfully, by the Creature, yet is it terminated on him. The Proposition therefore which asserts,* that the Worship which God denyes must be terminated on the Creature, *I deny as absolutely false, and so will you too,* Madam, *when you shall see the sense of it to be no other, but that a wicked man cannot Pray to God, or Worship him in an unlawful or forbidden manner, who is therefore a wicked man because he does so. What follows from hence is, that though God should have forbidden men to Worship him by Images, yet it does not follow but the Worship so given, would be terminated on him.*

But

But now to speak to his second Proposition in which the main force of this Argument consists).

We utterly deny that God in the second Commandment, forbids himself to be Worshipped by a Crucifix, for example, or such like Sacred Image; for such only are the subject of the present Controversie. What he forbids there, is to give his Worship to Idols: and this is clear from the Circumstances of the Text: First, Because this Commandment, if St. Austins *Judgement be to be followed, is but a part or Explication of the first, Thou shalt have no other Gods before me: Secondly, because the Hebrew word* Pesel, *in Latine* Sculptile, *is used in Scripture to signifie an Idol: Let them be confounded who adore* Sculptilia, *that is, Idols, saith the Psalmist; and so the Septuagint translate it in this very place* εἴδωλον, *an Idol, Thou shalt not make to thy self an Idol; so that it was an artifice of the Protestants, to make their assertion seem plausible, to translate Image instead of Idol; and not a certain kind of Image neither, but any whatsoever. Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image. Now what is all this to Catholicks, who neither make to themselves, nor adore Idols; nor yield Soveraign honour or acknowledgement of Deity to any but God? We give indeed a veneration to Images, but the Image of God is not another God besides him, nor is the Worship of it, the Worship of another God, but of him who is represented by it: for St.* Basil *saith, The Worship of an Image stayes not there, but is referred or carryed to the prototype, or thing represented.*

We

We give therefore an inferiour, or relative honour only to the Sacred Images of Christ, and his blessed Mother, and Saints; not latriam, *the Worship due to God, but* Honorariam adorationem, *a certain honorary Worship, expressed by kissing them, or putting off our Hats, or kneeling before them, much like the Worship given to the Chair of State, or the Kings Picture, or his Garment by the like actions: or to come nearer to the subject, such as was commanded to be given to Moses and Joshua to the ground whereon they stood, by putting off their Shoos, because it was holy; and by the Jews, in adoring the footstool of God, or falling down before it,* Psal. 98. 5. *and in Worshipping (as St.* Jerome *testifies they did) that part of the Temple called the Holy of Holies, because there were the Cherubims (sacred Images ordered by God himself to be placed there) the propitiatory (representing Gods Throne) and the Ark, (his footstool) In a word, such as the Protestants themselves give to the Name of Jesus, when they hear it spoken, by putting off their Hats, and bowing at it; or to the Elements of Bread and Wine in the Supper, by kneeling before them, as figures representing the death of Christ. If condescendence to the conscience of weaker Brethren, will permit to own they have any honour or veneration for them, or for the Altar before which they bow. To conclude this point; the Objector brings a Text, which forbids us to give the Soveraign honour due to God, to an Idol; but let us hear out of Scripture an express Text that it is not lawful to give to holy Images, and other things relating to God, an inferiour or relative*

Ep. 17. ad Marcellam.

Worship,

Worſhip, ſuch as we have declared, and that will be to the purpoſe.

6. *He aims to conclude the Catholick Church guilty of Idolatry, from the adoration of the bread (as he believes it) in the Euchariſt. Now to do this, he ought to prove, that what we adore in the Euchariſt, is bread indeed. But inſtead of that, he brings a compariſon between our adoration of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, and the Heathens adoration of the Sun:* viz. That the Papiſts by the ſame Argument, make the Worſhip of the bread in the Eucharift not to be Idolatry, which would excuſe the Heathens Worſhip of the Sun and of their Statues from Idolatry; For if it be not therefore Idolatry, *ſayes he*, becauſe they ſuppoſe the bread to be God, then the Worſhip of the Sun was not Idolatry in them, who ſuppoſed the Sun to be God, *I ſhall not complain here of the unhandſomneſs of the expreſſion, that Catholicks ſuppoſe the bread to be God, juſt as the Heathens ſuppoſed the Sun to be God: whereas he knows, that the Catholicks believe, that the ſubſtance of the bread is changed into Chriſts body; but ſhall anſwer to the Argument, That the Worſhip of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, is not Idolatry, becauſe we only ſuppoſe him to be really preſent under the form of bread, but becauſe we know and believe this upon the ſame grounds and Motives upon which we believe (and thoſe Motives ſtronger than any Proteſtant hath (if he have no other than the Catholick) to believe) that Chriſt is God, and conſequently to be adored. And therefore that you may the better ſee the inefficacioufneſs of the Argument, ſuppoſe it*

drops

dropt from the Pen of an Arrian *against the adoration of Christ as God, and it will be of as much force to evince that to be Idolatry, as it is from the Objection to prove the adoration of him in the Eucharist to be so; see there how an* Arrian *might argue in the same form. The same Argument which would make the grosseſt Heathen Idolatry lawful, cannot excuſe any act from Idolatry: but the same argument, whereby the Proteſtants make the Worſhip of Chriſt (a pure man, ſayes the* Arrian) *not to be Idolatry: would make the groſſeſt Heathen Idolatry not to be ſo: For if it be not therefore Idolatry, becauſe they ſuppoſe Chriſt to be God, then the Worſhip of the Sun was not Idolatry, by them who ſuppoſed the Sun to be God, &c. Now the ſame anſwer which ſolves the* Arrians *arguments againſt the adoration of Chriſt as God, ſerves no leſs to ſolve the Objectors Argument againſt the adoration of him in the Euchariſt, ſince we have a like Divine Revelation for his real preſence under the Sacramental Signs, as we have for his being true God and Man.*

But what if Catholicks ſhould be miſtaken in their belief? would it then follow, that they were Idolaters? Dr. Taylor, *an Eminent and leading man amongſt the Proteſtants, denyes the conſequence. His words are theſe, in the Liberty of* Prophecying, *Sect.* 20. *Numb.* 26. Idolatry, *ſayes he*, is a forſaking the true God, and giving Divine Worſhip to a creature, or to an Idol, that is, to an Imaginary God, who hath no foundation in Eſſence or Exiſtence: And this is that kind of ſuperſtition, which by Divines is called the ſuperſtition of an undue object:

Now

Now it is evident, that the object of their (that is, the Catholicks) adoration (that which is represented to them in their minds, their thoughts and pupoſes, and by which God principally, if not ſolely, takes eſtimate of humane actions) in the bleſſed Sacrament, is the only true and eternal God, hypoſtatically joyned with his holy humanity, which humanity they believe actually preſent under the Veil of the Sacramental Signs; and if they thought him not preſent, they are ſo far from worſhipping the bread in this caſe, that themſelves profeſs it Idolatry to do ſo; which is a demonſtration (*mark that*) that their ſoul hath nothing in it, that is Idolatrical. If their confidence and fanciful opinion (ſo he terms the faith of Catholicks) hath engaged them upon ſo great a miſtake (as without doubt, he ſayes, it hath) yet the will hath nothing in it, but what is a great enemy to Idolatry. *Et nihil ardet in inferno niſi propria voluntas*; that is, Nothing burns in Hell, but proper Will. *Thus* Dr. Taylor; *and I think it will be a task worthy the Objectors pains, to ſolve his Argument, if he will not abſolve us from being Idolaters.*

§. 7. *He proceeds to prove, that Catholicks are guilty of Idolatry, by their Invocation of Saints: And his Argument is this*; If the ſuppoſition of a middle excellency between God and us, be a ſufficient ground for formal Invocation, then the Heathens Worſhip of their inferiour Deities, could be no Idolatry, for the Heathens ſtill pretended, that they did not give to them the Worſhip proper to the Supream

Supream God, which is as much as is pretended by the devouteſt Papiſts in juſtification of the Invocation of Saints. *To anſwer this Argument, I ſhall need little more than to explicate the hard words in it; which thus I do. By perſons of a middle excellency, we underſtand perſons endowed with ſupernatural gifts of Grace in this life, and Glory in Heaven, whoſe prayers by conſequence are acceptable and available with God, what he means by formal Invocation, I underſtand not well: but what we underſtand by it, is deſiring or praying thoſe juſt perſons to pray for us. The Supream Deity of the Heathens is known to be* Jupiter, *and their inferiour Deities,* Venus, Mars, Bacchus, Vulcan, *and the like rabble of Devils, as the Scripture calls them, The gods of the Heathens are Devils. The terms thus explicated, 'tis eaſie to ſee the inconſequence of the Argument, that becauſe the Heathens were Idolaters in worſhipping* Mars *and* Venus, *their inferiour Deities, or rather Devils, though they pretended not to give them the Worſhip proper to* Jupiter *their Supream God: Therefore the Catholicks, muſt be guilty of Idolatry, in deſiring the ſervants of the true God, to pray for them to him; upon this account we muſt not deſire the prayer of a juſt man, even in this life, becauſe this formal Invocation will be to make him an inferiour Deity.*

But if ſome Sect of Heathens, as the Platoniſts, *did attain to the knowledge of the true God, yet* St. Paul *ſays, they did not glorifie him as God; but changed his glory into an Image made like to corruptible man, adoring and offering Sacrifice*

due

due to God alone, to the Statues themselves, or the inferior Deities they supposed to dwell or assist in them. Which inferior Deities S. Austin *upon the ninety sixth* Psalm, *proves to be Devils or evil Angels, because they required Sacrifice to be offered to them, and would be worshipped as Gods. Now what comparison there is between this worship of the Heathens inferior Deities, and Christians worship of Saints and Angels, let the same S.* Austin *declare in his twentieth Book against* Faustus *the* Manichæan, *chap.* 21. Faustus *there calumniates the Catholicks (the word is S.* Austins*) because they honored the Memories or Shrines of Martyrs, charging them to have turned the Idols into Martyrs, whom they worship* (said he) *with like Vows. The Objection you see is not new, that Catholicks make inferior Deities of their Saints.* Faustus *long ago made it, and S.* Austins *Answer will serve as well now as then.* Christian people, *says he,* do with Religious Solemnity celebrate the memory of Martyrs, both to excite to the imitation of them, and to become partakers of their Merits, and be holpen by their prayers, but to that we erect Altars, not to any of the Martyrs, but to the God of Martyrs, although in memory of the said Martyrs; for what Bishop officiating at the Altar, in the places where their holy bodies are deposited; does say at any time, we offer to thee *Peter*, or *Paul*, or *Cyprian?* but what is offered to God, who crown'd the Martyrs, at the Memories or Shrines of those whom he crowned; that being put in mind by the very places, a greater affection

may be raiſed in us to quicken our love, both to thoſe whom we may imitate, and towards him by whoſe aſſiſtance we can do it. We worſhip therefore the Martyrs with that Worſhip of love and ſociety, with which even in this life alſo holy men of God are worſhipped, whoſe heart we judge prepared to ſuffer the like Martyrdom for the truth of the Goſpel. But we worſhip *them* ſo much the more devoutly, becauſe more ſecurely, after they have overcome all the Incertainties of this world; as alſo we praiſe them more confidently, now reigning Conquerors in a more happy life, than whilſt they were fighting in this; but with that Worſhip, which in Greek is called *Latria* (and cannot be expreſſed by one word in Latin) for as much as it is a certain ſervice properly due to the Divinity, we neither worſhip them, nor teach them to be worſhipped, but God alone. Now whereas the offering of Sacrifice belongs to this Worſhip (of *Latria*) from whence they are called Idolaters, who gave it alſo to Idols, by no means do we ſuffer any ſuch thing, or command it to be offered, to any Martyr, or any holy ſoul, or any Angel: And whoſoever declines into this Error, we reprove him by ſound Doctrine, either that he may be corrected, or avoided—— *And a little after.* It is a much leſs ſin, for a man to be derided by the Martyrs for drunkenneſs, then ever faſting to offer Sacrifice to them. I ſay to ſacrifice to Martyrs, I ſay not to ſacrifice to God in the memories (or Churches) of the Martyrs, which we do moſt frequently

quently, by that *rite* alone, by which in the manifestation of the New Testament he hath commanded Sacrifice to be offered to him; which belongs to that Worship, which is called *Latria*, and is due only to God. *This was the Doctrine and practice of Christian people in S.* Augustines *time, and that he himself held formal Invocations a part of the Worship due to Saints; is evident from the prayer he made to S.* Cyprian *after his Martyrdom.* Adjuvetq; nos Beatus Cyprianus orationibus suis, *&c.* Let Blessed *Cyprian* therefore help us, (*who are still encompassed with this mortal flesh, and labour as in a dark cloud*) with his prayer, *that by Gods grace we may, as far as we are able, imitate his good works. Thus S.* Austin, *where you see he directs his prayer to S.* Cyprian, *which I take to be formal Invocation; and for a further confirmation of it, we have the ingenuous Confession of* Calvin *himself, Instit. l.* 3. *c.* 20. *n.* 22. *where speaking of the third Council of* Carthage, *in which St.* Austin *was present, he acknowledged it was the custom at that time to say,* Sancta Maria, aut Sancte Petre Ora pro nobis; *Holy* Mary, *or holy* Peter *pray for us.*

But now, Madam, *what if after all this, he himself shall deny, that any of the opposite Tenets are Articles of his faith, viz.* That honor is not to be given to the Images of Christ and his Saints, that what appears to be bread in the Eucharist, is not the body of Christ: That it is not lawful to invocate the Saints to pray for us. *Press him close, and I believe you shall find him deny, that he believes any one of these Nega-*

tive points to be Divine truths; and if so, you will easily see his charge of Idolatry against us, to be vain and groundless.

Having thus given a direct and punctual answer to his Argument, I must now expect as much charity from him, as is consistent with Scripture and Reason. *How much that is, you will see in his third Answer to the first Question. But to proceed.*

§. 8. *He brings a Miscellany of* such opinions *and* practices *(as he calls them)* which are very apt to hinder a good life; and therefore none who have a care of their salvation, can venture their souls in the communion of such a Church, which either enjoyns, or publickly allows them, *He reckons up no less than ten.* 1. *That we* destroy the necessity of good life, by making the Sacrament of Penance *(that is, Confession and Absolution)* joyned with contrition, sufficient for salvation. *And do not Protestants make contrition alone, which is less, sufficient for salvation? But perhaps the joyning of confession and absolution with contrition, makes it of a malignant nature: If so, certainly when the Book of Common Prayer in the visitation of the sick, enjoyns the sick man, if he find his conscience troubled with any weighty matter, to make a special confession, and receive absolution from the Priest in the same words the Catholick Church uses, it prescribes him, that as a means to prepare himself for a holy death, which in the judgement of the Objector, destroys the necessity of good life.*

2. Ca-

2. Catholicks, *he says*, take off the care of good life, by supposing an expiation of sin (by the prayer of the living) after death: *But certainly the belief of temporal pains to be sustained after death, if there be not a perfect expiation of sin in this life, by works of penance, is rather apt to make a man careful not to commit the least sin, than to take off the care of a good life. And though he be ascertained by faith, that he may be holpen by the charitable suffrages of the faithful living, yet this is no more encouragement to him to sin, than it would be to a Spendthrift to run into debt, and be cast into Prison, because he knows he may be relieved by the charity of his Friends. If he were sure there were no Prison for him, that would be an encouragement indeed to play the Spendthrift. And this is the case of the Protestants in their denyal of Purgatory.*

3. The sincerity of Devotion, *he says*, is much obstructed, by prayers in a language which many understand not. *If he speak of private prayers, all Catholicks are taught to say them in their Mother Tongue: If of the publick prayers of the Church, I understand not why it may not be done with as much sincerity of devotion, the people joyning their intention and particular prayers with the Priest, as their Embassador to God, as if they understood him: I am sure the effects of a sincere devotion, for nine hundred years together which this manner of Worship produced in this Nation, were much different from those we have seen since the reducing of the publick Lyturgie into English, as is manifest from those Monuments,*

which yet remain of Churches, Colledges, Religious Houses, &c. with their endowments, and in the conversion of many Nations from Heathenism to Christianity, effected by the labours and zeal of English Missionaries in those times, &c. But this is a matter of Discipline, and so not to be regulated by the fancies of private men, but the judgement of the Church; and so universal hath this practice been both in the Primitive Greek and Latine Churches, and is still (by the confession of the (Protestant) Authors themselves of the Bible of many Languages, Printed at London, Anno, 1655.) *in most of the Sects of Christians, to have not only the Scriptures, but also the Liturgies and Rituals in a Tongue unknown, but to the Learned among them: that who will dispute against it, must prepare himself to hear the censure of S.* Austin, Ep. 118. *where he saith,* That it is a point of most insolent madness, to dispute whether that be to be observed, which is frequented by the whole Church through the world.

4. *He says,* The sincerity of Devotion is much obstructed, by making the efficacy of Sacraments depend upon the bare Administration, whether our minds be prepared for them or not. *In what Council this Doctrine was defined, I never read; but as for the Sacrament of Penance, which I suppose he chiefly aims at, I read in the Council of* Trent, Sess. 14. *Falso quidam calumniantur,* That some do falsly calumniate Catholick Writers, as if they taught, the Sacrament of Penance did confer Grace without

without the good motion of the receiver, which, the Church of God never taught nor thought. *But I am rather inclined to look upon this as a mistake, than a calumny in the Objector.*

5. *He says*, The sincerity of Devotion is much obstructed by discouraging the reading of Scriptures, which is our most certain rule of Faith and Life. *Here he calls the Churches prudential dispensing the reading of Scripture to persons, whom she judges fit and disposed for it, and not to such whom she judges in a condition to receive, or do harm by it, a discouraging the reading of the Scriptures; which is no other than whereas S.* Paul, Coloss. 3. 21. *enjoyns Fathers not to provoke their children, lest they be discouraged; one should reprove a Father for discouraging his child, because he will not put a knife or sword into his hands, when he foresees he will do mischief with it to himself or others; the Scriptures in the hands of a meek and humble soul, who submits its judgement in the interpretation of it to that of the Church, is a Sword to defend it: but in the hands of an arrogant and presumptuous Spirit, that hath no Guide to interpret it, but its own fancy or passion, it is a dangerous weapon, with which he will wound both himself and others. The first that permitted promiscuous reading of Scripture in our Nation, was King* Henry *the eighth; and many years were not passed, but he found the ill consequences of it; for in a Book set forth by him in the year,* 1542. *he complains in the Preface*, That he found entred into some of his peoples hearts an

inclination to sinister understanding of it, presumption, arrogancy, carnal liberty and contention: which he compares to the seven worse Spirits in the Gospel, with which the Devil entred into the house that was purged and cleansed. Whereupon he declares that for that part of the Church ordained to be taught (that is, the Lay people) it ought not to be denied certainly, that the reading of the Old and New Testament is not so necessary for all those folks, that of duty they ought and be bound to read it; but as the Prince and Policy of the Realm shall think convenient, so to be tolerated or taken from it. Consonant whereunto, *saith he*, the Politick Law of our Realm, hath now restrained it from a great many. *This was the judgement of him, who first took upon him the Title of Head of the Church of* England; *and if that ought not to have been followed in after times, let the dire effects of so many new Sects and Phanaticisms, as have risen in* England *from the reading of it, bear witness. For as* S. Austin *says,* Neque enim natæ sunt Hæreses; Heresies have no other Origen but hence, that the Scriptures which in themselves are good, are not well understood, and what is understood amiss in them, is rashly and boldly asserted, *viz.* to be the sense of them. *And now whether the Scriptures left to the private interpretation of every fanciful Spirit, as it is among Protestants, be a most certain Rule of Faith and Life, I leave to your self to judge.*

Tract. 18. in Jo.

6. *He says,* The sincerity of devotion is much obstructed by the multitude of superstitious obser-

observations never used in the Primitive Church, as he is ready to defend, *he should have said to prove; for we deny any such to be used in the Church.*

7. *By the gross abuse of people in Pardons and Indulgencies. Against this I can assert as an eye-witness, the great devotion caused by the wholsome use of Indulgences in Catholick Countreys: there being no Indulgence ordinarily granted, but enjoyns him that will avail himself of it, to confess his sins, to receive the Sacraments, to pray, fast, and give alms, all which duties are with great devotion performed by Catholick people, which without the incitement of an Indulgence, had possibly been left undone.*

8. *He says,* The sincerity of devotion is much obstructed, by denying the Cup to the Laity, contrary to the practice of the Church in the solemn celebration of the Eucharist for a thousand years after Christ. *This thousand years after Christ makes a great noise, as if it were not as much in the power of the Church a thousand years after Christ, as well as in the first or second Century, to alter and change things of their own nature indifferent; such as the communicating under one or both kinds, was ever held to be by Catholicks. But although the Cup were not then denied to the Laity, yet that the custom of receiving but under one kind was permitted, even in the primitive Church, in private communions, the Objector seems to grant, because he speaks only of the Administration of it in the solemn Celebration; and that it was also in use in publick Communions, is evident from Examples*

of

of that time, both in the Greek Church, in the time of S. Chrysostome; *and of the Latin, in the time of S.* Leo *the great. As for the pretended obstruction of Devotion, you must know Catholicks believe that under either species or kind, whole Christ true God and man is contained and received; and if it be accounted an hindrance to devotion to receive the total refection of our soul, though but under one kind, what must it be to believe that I receive him under neither, but instead of him have Elements of Bread and Wine? Surely nothing can be more efficacious to stir up reverence and devotion in us, then to believe, that God himself will personally enter under our Roof.*

Sozomen. li. 8. Hist. c. 5. & Niceph. l. 13. c. 11. S. Leo. Ser. 4. de Quad.

The ninth Hindrance of the sincerity of devotion is, that we make it in the power of a person to dispense in Oathes and Marriages contrary to the Law of God. *To this I answer, That some kind of Oaths, the condition of the person and other circumstances considered, may be judged to be hurtful, and not fit to be kept, and the dispensation in them is, no more than to judge or determine them to be so: and consequently to do this cannot be a hinderance, but a furtherance to Devotion, nor is it contrary to the Law of God, which commands nothing that's hurtful to be done. As for Marriages, we acknowledge the Church may dispense, in some degrees of Consanguinity and Affinity, but in nothing contrary to the Law of God.*

His tenth pretended Obstruction of Devotion is, that we make disobedience to the Church in disputable matters, more hainous than disobedience to Christ in unquestionable things,

as

as Marriage, *he saith*, in a Priest to be a greater crime than Fornication. *I Answer, That whether a Priest may marry or no (supposing the Law of the Church forbidding it) is not a disputable matter; but 'tis out of Question, even by the Law of God, that Obedience is to be given to the Commands or Prohibitions of the Church: The Antithesis therefore between disobedience to the Church, in disputable matters, and disobedience to the Laws of Christ in unquestionable things, is not only impertinent to the Marriage of Priests which is unquestionably forbidden; but, supposing the matter to remain disputable after the Churches Prohibition, destroys all obedience to the Church. But if it suppose them only disputable before, then why may not the Church interpose her judgement, and put them out of dispute?*

But still it seems strange to them, who either cannot or will not take the Word of Christ, that is, his Counsel of Chastity, that Marriage in a Priest should be a greater sin than Fornication. *But he considers not, that though Marriage in it self be honorable, yet, if it be prohibited to a certain order of persons, by the Church to whom Christ himself commands us to give obedience, and they oblige themselves by a voluntary vow to live in perpetual Chastity, the Law of God commanding us to pay our Vows, its loses its honor in such persons, and if contracted after such vow made, is in the language of the Fathers no better than Adultery. In the primitive Church it was the custom of some Younger Widdows to dedicate themselves to the Service of the Church, and*

in

in order thereunto to take upon them a peculiar habit, and make a vow of continency for the future. Now in case they married after this, S. Paul *himself,* 1 Tim. 1. 12. *saith, That they incurred Damnation, because by so doing, they made void their first faith, that is, as the Fathers Expound it, the vow they had made. And the fourth Council of* Carthage, *in which were* 214 *Bishops, and among them S.* Austin *gives the reason in these words;* If Wives who commit Adultery are guilty to their Husbands, how much more shall such Widdows, as change their Religious state, be noted with the crime of Adultery? *And if this were so in Widdows, much more in Priests, if by marrying they shall make void their first Faith given to God, when they were consecrated in a more peculiar manner to his Service.*

Thus much may suffice for Answer to the Argument, which with its intricate terms may seem to puzzle an unlearned Reader; let us now speak a word to the true state of the Controversie, which is, whether Marriage or single life in a Priest be more apt to obstruct or further devotion. And S. Paul *himself hath determined the Question,* 1 Cor. 7. 32. *where he saith, He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to our Lord, how he may please our Lord; But he that is married careth for the things that are of the World, how he may please his Wife. This is the difference he putteth between the married and single life, that* this *is apt to make us care for the things which belong to God; and* that *to divert our thoughts from him to the things*

things of the World. Judge therefore which of these states is most convenient for Priests, whose proper office it is to attend wholly to the things of God?

Having thus cleared Catholick Doctrines, from being any ways obstructive to good life or devotion, I shall proceed to his third Argument, by which he will still prove that Catholicks run a great hazard of their souls, in adhering to the Communion of the Church of Rome, Because it exposeth the Faith of Christians to so great uncertainty. *This is a strange charge from the pen of a Protestant, who hath no other certainty for his faith but every mans Interpretation of the Letter of the Scriptures. But, first he saith it doth this,* By making the Authority of the Scriptures to depend upon the infallibility of the Church, when the Churches infallibity must be proved by the Scriptures.

To this I answer, That the Authority of the Scripture, not in it self, for so it hath its Authority from God; but in order to us and our belief of it, depends upon the infallibity of the Church, And therefore S. Austin *saith of himself,* That he would not believe the Gospel, unless the Authority of the Catholick Church did move him. *And if you ask him what moved him to submit to that Authority; he tells you,* That besides the Wisdom he found in the Tenets of the Church, there were many other things which most justly held him in it: as the consent of people and Nations, an Authority begun by Miracles, nourished by Hope, increased by Charity, and established by Antiquity, the

suc-

ſucceſſion of Prieſts, from the very Seat of S. *Peter*, to whom our Lord commended the feeding of his Sheep, unto the preſent Biſhoprick. Laſtly, The very name of Catholick which this Church alone, among ſo many Hereſies, hath not without cauſe obtained ſo particularly to her ſelf; that whereas all Hereticks would be called Catholicks, yet if a ſtranger demand where the Catholicks go to Church, none of theſe Hereticks dares to ſhew either his own houſe or Church. Theſe (*ſaith S.* Auſtin) ſo many and great, moſt dear bonds of the name of Chriſtians, do juſtly hold a believing man in the Catholick Church. *Theſe were the grounds which moved that great man to ſubmit to her Authority: And when Catholick Authors prove the infallibility of the Church from Scriptures, 'tis on Argument* ad hominem *to convince Proteſtants who will admit nothing but Scripture, and yet when they are convinced, quarrel at them as illogical diſputants, becauſe they prove it from Scripture.*

Next he ſaith we overthrow all foundation of Faith, becauſe We will not believe our ſenſes in the plaineſt objects of them. *But what if God have interpoſed his Authority, as he hath done in the caſe of the Euchariſt, where he tells us, that* it is his Body, *muſt we believe our ſenſes rather than God? or muſt we not believe them in other things, becauſe in the particular caſe of the Euchariſt we muſt believe God, rather than our ſenſes? Both theſe conſequences you ſee are abſurd: Now for the caſe it ſelf, in which he inſtances, Dr.* Taylor *above cited confeſſes, that they*

(viz.

(viz. *Catholicks*) have a Divine Revelation (viz. *Christs word, This is my Body*) whose Litteral and Grammatical sense, if that sense were intended, would warrant them to do violence to all the Sciences in the Circle; *but, I add, it would be no precedent to them not to believe their senses, in other the plainest objects of them, as in the matter of Tradition, or Christs Body after the Resurrection.*

3. *He saith that* We expose faith to great uncertainty, by denying to men the use of their judgement and reason, as to the matters of faith proposed by a Church, *that is, we deny particular mens Judgement, as to matters of faith, to be as good, if not better than the Churches, and to infer from hence, that we make Faith uncertain, is just as if on the contrary one should say, that Protestants make faith certain by exposing matter of faith determined by the Church, to be discussed and reversed by the Judgement and Reason (or rather fancy) of every private man. We have good store of this kind of certainty in* England. *But as for the use of our Judgement and Reason, as to the matters themselves proposed by the Church, it is the daily business of Divines and Preachers, not only to shew them not to be repugnant to any natural truth, but also to illustrate them with Arguments drawn from reason. But the use, he would have of reason, is I suppose, to believe nothing, but what his reason can comprehend, and this is not only irrational in its self, but contrary to the Doctrine of S.* Paul, *where he commands us to captivate our understandings to to the Obedience of Faith.*

4. *He*

4. *He adds,* We expose faith to uncertainty, by making the Church power extend to making new Articles of faith. *And this if it were true, were something indeed to his purpose. But the Church never yet owned any such power, in her General Councils, but only to manifest and establish the Doctrine received from her Fore-fathers; as is to be seen in the proœms of all the Sessions of the Council of* Trent, *where the Fathers before they declare what is to be believed, ever premise that what they declare, is the same they have received by Tradition from the Apostles. And because it may happen, that some particular Doctrine was not so plainly delivered to each part of the Church, as it happened in S.* Cyprians *case, concerning the non-rebaptization of Hereticks, we acknowledge it is in her power,* to make that necessary to be believed which was not so before, *not by inventing new Articles, but by declaring more explicitely the truths contained in Scripture and Tradition.*

Lastly he saith, We expose Faith to great uncertainty, *because the Church pretending to infallibility, does not determine Controversies on foot among our selves. As if faith could not be certain, unless all Controversies among particular men be determined, what then becomes of the certainty of Protestants faith, who could yet never find out a sufficient means to determine any one Controversie among them? for if that means be plain Scripture, what one judgeth plain, another judgeth not so, and they acknowledge no Judge between them to decide the Controversie. As for the Catholick Church if any Controversies arise concerning*

the

the Doctrine delivered (as in St. Cyprians *case) she determines the Controversie by declaring what is of Faith. And for other Controversies which belong not to faith, she permits, as St.* Paul *saith, every one to abound in his own sence. And thus much in Answer to his third Argument, by which, and what hath been said to his former Objections, it appears that he hath not at all proved what he asserted in his second Answer to the first Question, viz.* That all those who are in the Communion of the Church of *Rome* do run so great a hazard of their Salvation, that none who have a care of their souls ought to embrace or continue in it. *But he hath a third Answer for us, in case the former faile; and it is,*

§. 10. *That* a Protestant leaving the Communion of the Protestant Church doth incurr a greater guilt, than one who was bred up in the Church of *Rome*, and continues therein by invincible ignorance. *This is the directest answer he gives to the Question, and what it imports is this, That invincible Ignorance (and* he doth not know what allowance God will make for that neither) *is the only Anchor which a Catholick hath to save himself by. If by discoursing with Protestants, and reading their Books, he be not sufficiently convinced, whereas he ought in the supposition of the Answerer, to be so, that the Letter of the Scripture as interpretable by every private mans reason is a most certain Rule of Faith and Life; but is still over-ruled by his own Motives (the same which held St.* Austin *in the bosome of the Catholick Church) he is guilty of wilful Ignorance and consequently a lost man; there is no*

hope of Salvation for him. Much less for a Protestant who shall embrace the Catholick Communion, because he is supposed *(doubtless from the same Rule)* to have sufficient conviction of the Errors of the Roman Church, or is guilty of wilful Ignorance, If he have it not, which is a damnable sin, and unrepented of destroyes salvation. *So that now the upshot of of the Answer to the Question, Whether a Protestant embracing Catholick Religion upon the same motives, which one bred and well grounded in it, hath to remain in it, may be equally saved with him, comes to this, that they shall both be damned, though unequally, because the converted Catholick more deeply, than he that was bred so. And now who can but lament the sad condition of that great Doctor and Father of the Church, and hitherto reputed Saint,* Austin, *who rejecting the* Manichees *pretended rule of Scripture, upon the aforesaid grounds, left their Communion to embrace the Communion of the Church of* Rome ? *And what is become now of their distinction of points fundamental from not fundamental, which heretofore they thought sufficient to secure both Catholicks and Protestants Salvation, and to charge us with unconscionable uncharitableness in not allowing them to be sharers with us. The absurdness of these consequences may serve for a sufficient conviction of the nullity of his third and last answer to the first Question.*

As for what he saith to the second, I agree so far with him, that every Christian is bound to choose the Communion of the purest Church,

but

but which that Church is, must be seen by the grounds it brings to prove the Doctrines it teaches, to have been delivered by Christ and his Apostles. That Church is to be judged purest which hath the best grounds: and consequently, it is of necessity to Salvation to embrace the communion of it.

What then you are bound to do in reason and conscience is, to see which Religion of the two, hath the strongest Motives for it, and to embrace that as you will answer the contrary to God and your own soul. To help you to do this, and that the Answerer may have the less exception against them, I will give you a Catalogue of Catholick Motives (though not all neither) in the words of the forecited Dr. Taylor, *advertising only for brevity sake, I leave out some mentioned by him, and that in those I set down, you also give allowance for some expressions of his, which he hath mis-represented them: Thus then he,* Liberty of Proph. Sect. 20. *Speaking of Catholicks,* The beauty and Splendour of their Church, their pompous (he should have said) solemn Service; the stateliness and solemnity of the Hierarchy, their name of Catholick, which they suppose (he should have said, their very Adversaries give them) as their own due, and to concern no other Sect of Christians; the Antiquity of many of their Doctrines, (he should have said all) the continual succession of their Bishops, their immediate derivation from the Apostles; their Title to succeed St. *Peter,* the flattering (he should have said due) expression of Minor Bishops (he means,

acknowledging the Pope head of the Church) which by being old records, have obtained credibility; the multitude and variety of People which are of their perſwaſion; apparent conſent with Antiquity in many Ceremonials, which other Churches have rejected; and a pretended and ſometimes (he ſhould have ſaid alwayes) apparent conſent with ſome elder Ages in matters Doctrinal; The great conſent of one part with another in that which moſt of them affirm to be *de fide* (of Faith) The great differences which are commenced among their Adverſaries, abuſing the liberty of Prophecying into a very great licentiouſneſs; Their happineſs of being Inſtruments in converting divers (he ſhould rather have ſaid of all) Nations. The piety and auſterity of their Religious Orders of Men and Women; The ſingle life of their Prieſts and Biſhops, the ſeverity of their Faſts, and their exteriour obſervances, the great reputation of their firſt Biſhops for faith and ſanctity; the known holineſs of ſome of thoſe perſons, whoſe inſtitutes the Religious perſons pretend to imitate; the oblique Arts and indirect proceedings of ſome of thoſe who departed from them, & amongſt many other things the names of Heretick and Schiſmatick which they with infinite pertinacity (he ſhould have ſaid, upon the ſame grounds the Fathers did) faſten upon all that diſagree from them. Theſe things, ſaith he, and divers others may very eaſily perſwade perſons of much reaſon, and more piety to retain that which they know to have been the Religion of their Fore-fathers,

which

which had actually possession and seizure of mens understandings, before the opposite professions (to wit of Protestant, Presbyterian, Anabaptist, &c.) had a name.

Thus Dr. Taylor, *an eminent and leading man amongst the Protestants; and if* he *confess that these Motives were sufficient for a Catholick to retain his Religion, they must be of like force to perswade a dis-interessed Protestant to embrace it, unless the Protestants can produce Motives for their Religion of greater, or at least equal force, with these, which so great a man among them confesseth, that Catholicks have for theirs. Here therefore you must call upon the Author of the Paper you sent me to produce a Catalogue of grounds, or at least some one ground for the Protestant Religion of greater or equal force with all these: And as Dr.* Taylor *saith, divers others which he omitted,* viz. *The Scripture interpreted by the consent of Fathers, the determination of General Councils, the known Maxime of Catholicks, that nothing is to be believed of Faith, but what was received from their Fore-fathers as handed down from the Apostles. The testimony of the present Church, of no less Authority now, than in St.* Austins *time, both for the Letter and the sence of the Scripture,* &c. *Do this, and the Controversie will quickly be at an end. Particular disputes are endless, and above the understanding of such, as are not learned; but in grounds and principles, 'tis not so hard for Reason and common sence to Judge. That you may the better do it in your case, I shall desire you to take these two Cautions along with you:*

First, That the Subject of the present Controversie, are not those Articles in which the Protestants agree with us, and for which they may pretend to produce the same Motives, we do: But *in those in which they dissent from us such as are* no Transubstantiation, no Purgatory, no honour due to Images, no Invocation to Saints, and the like, *in which the very Essence of Protestant, as distinct from Catholik consists. What Motives they can or will produce for these. I do not foresee: The pretence of Scriptures being sufficiently plain hath no place here, because then the foresaid Negatives would be necessary to be believed as divine Truths. And for their own Reason and Learning, it will be found too light when put into the scale against that of the Catholick Church for so many Ages.*

The second Caution is, That you be careful to distinguish between Protestants producing grounds for their own Religion, and finding fault with ours. An Atheist can cavil and find fault with the grounds which learned men bring to prove a Deity, such as are the Order of this visible World, the general consent of Nations, &c. In this an Atheist thinks he doth somewhat. But *can he produce as good or better grounds for his own opinion? No, you see then 'tis one thing to produce grounds for what we hold, and another to find fault with those which are produced by the contrary part. The latter hath made Controversie so long, and the former will make it as short; let the Answerer therefore instead of finding fault with our Motives produce his own for the Articles in Controversie, and I am confident you will quickly discern which carry the most weight, and consequently which are to be preferred.*

A

A Defence of the foregoing Answer to the Questions.

CHAP. I.

Of the Idolatry practised in the Church of Rome, in the Worship of Images.

The introduction, concerning the occasion of the debate. The Church of Rome *makes its members guilty of Hypocrisie or Idolatry: First,* Of *the Worship of God by Images: Some propositions for clearing the notion of Divine Worship. It is in Gods power to determine the way of his Worship, which being determined, Gods Law, and not our intention, is to be the rule of Worship. The main question is, Whether God hath forbidden the worshipping of himself by an Image, under the notion of Idolatry? Of the meaning of the second Commandment, from the* terms *therein used; the large sense and importance of them, which cannot be understood only of Heathen Idols. Of the reason of that Law, from Gods infinite and invisible nature: How far that hath been acknowledged by Heathens? The Law against Image Worship no ceremonial*

Law, respecting meerly the Jews; the reason against it made more clear by the Gospel: The wiser Heathen did not worship their Images as Gods, yet their worship condemned as Idolatry. The Christian Church believed the reason of this Law to be immutable; Of the Doctrine of the second Council of Nice; *the opposition to it in* Greece, Germany, France *and* England. *Of the Scripture Instances of Idolatry contrary to the second Commandment, in the Golden Calf, and the Calves of* Dan *and* Bethel. *Of the distinctions used to excuse image-worship from being Idolatry: The vanity and folly of them. The instances supposed to be parallel answered.*

Madam,

The Introduction.

§. 1. THat increase of *Controversies* in my answer, which the Proposer of the *Questions*, calls a *superfœtation*, was but the natural issue of his own *Questions*. To which, I could not give a just answer, without mentioning the hazards a person runs of his salvation in the communion of the *Roman Church*: and if he thinks these too many (as in truth they are) he ought to condemn that *Church* for it, which hath been the cause of them. And, I know *no other end I had herein*, but to let you see, there can be no reason to forsake the communion of our *Church*, wherein the way of salvation is the same with that of the *Apostolical* and *Primitive Church*, for another, which hath degenerated so much from it; as I hope will appear in the following Discourse.

To

To wave therefore any farther debate, *concerning the terms or sense of the Questions: As to the occasion of them*, I could not but suppose it to relate to your own condition; and I dare appeal to himself, Whether the Question of the possibility of the salvation of a *Protestant* turn'd to the *Church* of *Rome* were moved for any other end, than thereby the easier to draw persons of our *Church* into their communion; which being so common, and yet so weak an Artifice, I had reason to premise an answer to that purpose: and I do still affirm, that such a possibility being granted, it is no sufficient Motive to any one to leave the communion of one *Church* for another. And whether this be to his Question or no, I am sure it is very much to the purpose, for which this Controversie was first started. I beseech you therefore, *Madam*, do not so much disparage your own Judgement, and the *Church* you have been bred up in, as to forsake it, till some better reason be offered, than the Proposer pretends that his *Questions* imply: Which, if not for your own sake, yet for mine I desire you to insist upon, that I may know one reason at least, from them, (which I cannot yet procure, although I have often requested it) why the believing all the ancient *Creeds* and leading a good life, may not be sufficient to salvation, unless one be of the communion of the *Church* of *Rome*? But lest I should be thought to digress, I return to his Papers, and am willing to pass over his unhandsome reflection on our *Church as in a sinking condition*, which *God* hath hitherto preserved, and I hope

hope will do, to the confuſion of its enemies: But why he ſhould call my compariſon a ſuppoſition, and his own a truth, before he proved their *Church* to be the *Catholick Church*, I am yet to ſeek. And ſo I come to the main buſineſs.

§. 2. My ſecond anſwer was, *That all thoſe who are in the communion of the Church of* Rome, *do run ſo great a hazard of their ſalvation, that none who have a care of their ſouls, ought to embrace it, or continue in it*; which I am amazed he ſhould ſay, *was not pertinent to the Queſtion*, if the *Queſtion* were propounded for any ones ſatisfaction, that doubted which *Churches* communion it were beſt to embrace? This I proved,

Of the Idolatry of the Roman Church.

1. Becauſe *They muſt by the terms of that communion, be guilty either of Hypocriſie or Idolatry*; either of which, are ſins inconſiſtent with ſalvation. Here *he charges me with a contradiction*, becauſe I over-prove what I intended; but he may eaſily excuſe me from it, if he will allow the poſſibility of ſalvation to any one who commits any wilful ſins; for in the caſe of any ſuch ſins, it is true, that they are inconſiſtent with ſalvation, and yet he that doth commit them, doth but run the hazard of ſalvation, becauſe he may repent of them. *But if it be a contradiction to ſay, that ſome ſins are inconſiſtent with ſalvation, yet thoſe who commit them, may be ſaved, though hardly*; he muſt make all who commit any wilful ſin to be unavoidably damned; and then it is to no purpoſe, what *Church* we are of.

The

The meaning therefore was this, That Hypocriſie and Idolatry, are ſins inconſiſtent with a ſtate of ſalvation; and there is no way to eſcape being damned, but by the repentance of thoſe who are guilty of them. (But of this more at large in the vindication of my third Anſwer) and thoſe who are in the communion of the *Church* of *Rome*, muſt be guilty either of the one or the other of theſe, I proved by this Argument, *That Church which requires giving to the creature the Worſhip due only to the Creator, makes the members of it guilty of Hypocriſie or Idolatry; but the Church of* Rome *in the Worſhip of God by Images, the adoration of Bread in the Euchariſt, and the formal invocation of Saints*, doth require giving to the creature the worſhip due only to the Creator, therefore it makes the members of it guilty of Hypocriſie or *Idolatry*. Which I did prove by parts.

Of the Worſhip of Images.

1. §. 3. Concerning the *Worſhip* of *God* by Images, I proved that it could not be terminated on *God*, becauſe in the ſecond Commandment he not only denys to receive it, but threatens to puniſh thoſe who give it. To this he anſwers, 1. *That it is a contradiction to ſay, that it is the worſhip of God by an Image, and yet be terminated wholly on the creature.* 2. *That this is built, on a miſtake of the nature of humane acts, which though they ought to be governed by the Law of God, yet when they ſwerve from it, ceaſe not to tend to their own proper objects: and that Gods prohibition of ſuch or ſuch a kind of Worſhip, may make it to be unlawful, but hinders not the act from tending, whither it*

is

is intended; which he proves *by the prayers of Thieves and Murderers, to God for good ſucceſs*; *the Jews offering to God in Sacrifice the blind and the lame, which he hath forbidden*; Cains *offering a Sacrifice to God, which he refuſed to accept of*; from whence he concludes, *That though God ſhould have forbidden men to worſhip him by Images, yet it doth not follow, but the worſhip ſo given, would be terminated on him.* 3. *That the ſecond Commandment only forbids the worſhip of Idols, or the giving the Soveraign honour due to God to an Idol*; *but this doth not forbid the worſhip of Images, becauſe they give to them only an inferiour and relative honour, and not, that worſhip which is due to God.* This is the ſubſtance of his anſwer: but to let you *ſee* the inſufficiency of it, I ſhall prove theſe two things: 1. That where God hath prohibited any particular way or means of giving worſhip to himſelf, that worſhip ſo given, cannot be ſaid to be terminated on him. 2. That God in the ſecond Commandment hath expreſly prohibited the giving any worſhip to himſelf by an Image; and not barely the worſhip of Idols.

1. That where God hath prohibited any particular way or means of giving worſhip to himſelf, that worſhip ſo given, cannot be ſaid to be terminated on him: And however *new* this way of propoſing this Argument ſeems to him, I do not queſtion to make it good, notwithſtanding his ſo peremptory denying it, as abſolutely falſe. But in order to the clearing of it, I ſhall lay down theſe Propoſitions.

1. That

1. That worſhip is nothing elſe but an external ſignification of honour and reſpect. For we do not here ſpeak concerning the bare internal acts of the mind; but of the way whereby the eſteem we have in our minds, is expreſſed in ſuch a manner as to give honour to that which we ſo eſteem.

2. That the ſignification of honour, which is due to *God* is not to be meaſured by the intentions of men, againſt the declared will of *God*. For, it being in his power to determine in what way he will be worſhipped, we are not to enquire, whether men do intend any act of theirs for his honour; but whether God doth allow it or no? And herein lyes his great miſtake in thinking, *That mens intentions are to be the rule of Divine Worſhip*: ſo that what they deſign for the honour of God, muſt needs end in it. Whereas, if *God* hath the power of making a rule for his own worſhip, he cannot be honoured by mens doing any thing againſt his declared Will, whatever their intention be. For, then *God* might be honoured by the moſt palpable acts of diſobedience; which is a plain contradiction; for what can be greater diſhonour to *God*, than to break his Laws for his *Honour*.

3. The Divine Law being the rule of Worſhip, all prohibited ways of worſhip muſt receive that *denomination* which *God* himſelf gives them. As if a Prince ſhould declare it by his Laws, to be *Treaſon* for any man to bow down to a *Sign-Poſt* with his head upon it, under pretence of giving the greater honour to his Prince; I deſire to know, whether a mans intentions

ons of honouring his Prince thereby, excuſe him from Treaſon or no? So it is in our caſe, if God abſolutely prohibits the worſhip of himſelf by an Image (whatever the intention of the perſon be) and calls this by the name of *Idolatry*, no mans directing the intention of his mind beyond the Image, can excuſe him from it. For whither ſoever this worſhip may finally be directed by the intention of the worſhipper, it is plain that God (who certainly is the beſt Judge in this caſe) does interpret it to be terminated on the Image: And therefore the Acts 7. 41, 42. Pſal. 106. 19. *Scripture* ſayes, that the *Iſraelites* when they worſhipped the *Calfe*, *offered Sacrifice to an Idol*, and that *they worſhipped the molten Image*, not God by it, though they ſo intended. From whence it neceſſarily follows, that the worſhip of God by an Image, when himſelf hath prohibited it, and declared it *Idolatry*, (as I ſhall prove he hath done in the ſecond Commandment) ought not to be ſaid to be terminated on *God*, but only on the Image; for no man will be ſo abſurd, as to ſay, that an act of Idolatry is terminated upon God. By which we ſee, how far it is *from the appearance of a contradiction*, to ſay that the worſhip of *God* by an *Image* being declared to be *Idolatry* by himſelf, ſhould be terminated wholly on the creature, (which are but other words explaining the nature of Idolatry) and what an eaſie anſwer will take off all his other Inſtances. For thoſe do not ſuppoſe, *any prohibited object* or *means* of worſhip, which is the only thing we ſpeak of; but either praying to the true God for bad

ends,

ends, *as in the case of Thieves and Murderers praying for good success*; or bringing something in Sacrifice to him which he had forbidden, *as the Jews offering the blind and the lame*: or some miscarriage in the minds of them that sacrifice or pray to him, as in *Cains oblation, and wicked mens prayers*; but all these are very remote from the present debate, concerning an *object* or *means of worship* prohibited by *God* himself under the notion of *Idolatry*. This being cleared, I come to prove the second, in which (as he truly observes) the main force of this argument consists.

Of the meaning of the second Commandment.

§. 4. 2. That God in the second Commandment hath expressly prohibited the giving any worship to himself by an Image: and not meerly *giving the worship of God to Idols*, as he asserts. Our Controversie now being about the sense of a Law, the best wayes we have to find out the meaning of it, are either, from the *terms* wherein it is expressed, or from the *reason* annexed to it; or from the *judgement* of those, whom we believe best able to understand, and interpret it. I shall therefore prove that to be the meaning of this *Law of God* which I have set down, from every one of these wayes.

1. From the *terms* wherein the Law is expressed: this I the rather insist upon, because it is the way himself hath chosen: for he saith, *The Hebrew word* Pesel, *in Latin* Sculptile *is used in Scripture to signifie an Idol, and so the LXX. translate it in this place by* εἴδωλον; and therefore saith, *it was an artifice of the Protestants to translate it, Image instead of Idol, and not any*

certain

certain kind of Image neither, but any whatſoever; Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven Image, inſtead of, Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf an Idol. By his own acknowledgement then, we are to judge the ſenſe of the *Law*, by the importance of the words therein uſed; but I ſhall prove, Firſt, That ſuppoſing *Peſel* did ſignifie only an *Idol*, yet that were not enough. Secondly, That *Peſel* is very properly rendred by the *Proteſtants*, and that it doth not ſignifie barely an *Idol*.

1. Suppoſing that were the ſignification of *Peſel* which he contends for, that were not enough, unleſs there had been no other word but that uſed in the Law: but another word is added, to prevent a miſtake of that nature, of as large a ſignification as may be to this purpoſe: which is, *Themuna*, which they render *ſimilitude* as well as we; and is never uſed, in the whole Scripture, to ſignifie ſuch an *Idol* as he ſuppoſes this Law intends. To what purpoſe then are words of the largeſt ſignification put into a *Law*; if the ſenſe be limitted according to the moſt narrow acceptation of one word mentioned therein? For there is no kind of Image, whether graven, or painted, whether of a real or imaginary being, but is comprehended under the ſignification of the words ſet down in the Law: for not only the making a *ſimilitude* in general, is forbidden, but *any kind of ſimilitude whether of things in Heaven, or Earth, or under the Earth, to bow down to them, or worſhip them.* I confeſs it cannot enter into my mind, how *God* ſhould have forbidden the

worſhip

worſhip of Images by more expreſs and emphatical words than he hath done; and if he had uſed any other words, their ſenſe might as well have been perverted as theſe are. If a Prince ſhould under a very ſevere penalty forbid all his ſubjects making any *Image* or *reſemblance*, with an intent to give honor to him by kneeling before it; would not that man be thought very ridiculous, who ſhould go about to interpret the *Law* thus, that the Prince did not forbid them to make any *picture* of *Himſelf* or his *Son*, or any of his *Favourites* (for the worſhip of theſe could not but redound to his own *Honour*) but only forbad them to make the Image of an *Ape*, or an *Aſs*, or a *Tyger*, thinking to honour their Prince thereby? Much ſuch an Expoſition is that, here given of the Law; *God* forbids any Image or ſimilitude to be made with reſpect to his worſhip (for it is ridiculous to imagine the *Law* means any thing elſe) but, he ſaith, *This Law muſt not be underſtood to exclude a Crucifix*, nor I ſuppoſe any Image of *God* himſelf: (at leaſt as he appeared of old;) nor *of his Saints or Angels, with an intention to worſhip God by them*; but only they ſhould not worſhip *Apis* or *Dagon*, an *Ichneumon* or a *Crocodile*, or any of the moſt ridiculous follies of the Heathen. If this had been the meaning of the Law, why was it not more plainly expreſſed? Why were none of the words elſwhere uſed, by way of contempt of the *Heathen Idols* here mentioned, as being leſs liable to ambiguity? Why in ſo ſhort a comprehenſion of *Laws*, is this *Law* ſo much enlarged above

what it might have been, if nothing but what he ſaith, were only meant by it? For then the meaning of the two firſt Precepts might have been ſummed up in very few words; *You ſhall have no other Gods but me*; and you *ſhall worſhip the Images of no other Gods but me*. This is his meaning, but far enough from being that of the *ſecond Commandment*.

2. The only *word* he inſiſts upon, which is *Peſel*, is very properly rendred *an Image*, and it doth not ſignifie barely an *Idol*: the *word* properly ſignifies any thing that is *carved*, or *cut out of wood or ſtone*: and it is no leſs than forty ſeveral times rendred by the *LXX.* by γλυπτὸν, *ſculptile*, and but thrice by εἴδωλον, and which is very obſervable, although *Exod.* 20. 4. they render it by εἴδωλον, yet in the repetition of the *Law*, Deut. 5. 8. the *Alexandrian MS.* hath it γλυπτὸν, and *Deut.* 4. 16. in other Copies of the *LXX.* the ſame word is tranſlated γλυπτὸν, from whence it is plain, that when they tranſlate it by an *Idol*, they mean no more thereby than a *graven image*; and *Iſa.* 40. 18. they tranſlate it, by ὅμοιον, which is properly an *image*; ſo that no aſſiſtance can be given him by that *Tranſlation*; and the *Vulgar Latin* it ſelf uſeth *Idolum*, *Sculptile* and *Imago*, all to expreſs the ſame thing. By which it appears, that any Image being made ſo far the object of Divine Worſhip, that men do bow down before it; doth thereby become an *Idol*, and on that account is forbidden in this Commandment.

Iſa. 44 9, 10, 13

§. 5.

§. 5. 3. We consider the *reason* given of this Law, which will more fully explain the meaning of it; which the *Scripture* tells us, was derived from *Gods* infinite and incomprehensible nature, which could not be represented to men, but in a way that must be an infinite disparagement to it. *To whom will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto him? The workman melteth a graven Image, and the Goldsmith spreadeth it over with gold, &c. Have ye not known? Have ye not heard? Hath it not been told you from the beginning? Have ye not understood from the foundation of the earth? It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, &c.* I desire to know whether this reason be given against *Heathen Idols*, or those Images which were worshipped for *Gods* or no? or whether, by this reason *God* doth not declare, that all worship given to him by any visible representation of him, is extreamly dishonourable to him? And to this purpose, when this Precept is enforced on the people of *Israel* by a very particular caution, *Take ye therefore good heed to your selves, lest ye corrupt your selves, and make you a graven Image, the similitude of any figure, &c.* The ground of that caution, is expressed in these words; *For ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you.* If the whole intention of the Law, were only to keep them from worshipping the *Heathen Idols*, or *Images for Gods*, to what purpose is it here mentioned *that they saw no similitude of God when he spake to them?* For although *God* appeared with a *similitude* then, yet

Of the reason of the second Commandment.

Isa. 40. 19. 20. 21. 22.

Deut. 4. 15, 16, &c.

there might have been great reaſon againſt worſhipping the *Heathen Idols*, or fixing the intention of their Worſhip upon the *bare Image*. But this was a very great reaſon, why they ought not to think of honouring *God* by an Image; for if he had judged that, a ſuitable way of Worſhip to his Nature and Excellency; he would not have left the choice of the *Similitude* to themſelves, but would have appeared himſelf in ſuch a *Similitude* as had beſt pleaſed him.

Of the wiſer Heathens Notion of Images. *Theodoret. c. Græc. Serm. 3. p. 519.*

§. 6. From hence the wiſer perſons of the *Heathens* themſelves condemned the Worſhip of *God* by Images, as incongruous to a Divine *Nature*, and a diſparagement to the *Deity*. So *Theodoret* tells us, that *Zeno* in his Books of *Government*, did abſolutely forbid *the making any Images for Worſhip, becauſe they were not things worthy of God*: And that *Xenophanes Colophonius* derided the folly of thoſe who made their *Images* which they Worſhipped, to be *like themſelves*, and by the ſame reaſon, ſaith he, if Horſes and Elephants could paint as men can, no doubt the Gods *would* be made in their ſhape; as the *Ethiopians*, and *Thracians*, and others, made their *Gods* in their own colour and faſhion: But he adds, *That the true God ought not to be repreſented by the reſemblance of men to whom he was unlike in body and mind.* And that the reaſon which hindred *Plato* from prohibiting all manner of Images, was only the fear of *Socrates* his Fate: for, ſaith he, *he did forbid all private Images, all Images of Gold*

Clem. Alex. and. Strom. 5. p. 584.

Gold and Silver, of Ivory, of Iron and Brass, and left only Wood and Stone, which being so contemptible matter, might more easily keep the people from Worshipping Images made of them: As God himself, saith he, derideth the Idolater in the Propht, *he burneth part thereof in the fire, and the residue thereof maketh he a God, even his graven Image.* *Antisthenes* in *Clemens Alexandrinus* condemns the use of *Images* for Instruction, *because there is so great a dissimilitude between God and any visible representation of him, that no man can learn any thing of God, from an Image:* and *Xenophon* to the same purpose, *that God is great and powerful, but we know not how to represent him.* And *Clemens* gives that reason why *Numa* prohibited among the *Romans* all *Images* to represent the *Deity, because we could not attain to any due conception of the Deity, but only by our minds*; which is the same reason that *Plutarch* gives. And therefore *Varro* in the known Testimony to this purpose, speaking of the old *Romans* who had no Images for 170 years in their Divine Worship, saith, *that if the same Custom had continued, their Worship would have been more pure and chaste; and that those who first placed Images in places of Divine Worship, increased their Errour, and took away their Reverence*; Wisely judging, saith S. *Augustine*, that *the folly of Images would easily bring the Deity into contempt.* And *Augustus*, as *Agrippa* in *Philo* reports, after he understood, that the *Jews* in their Temple had no Images or visible representations of the *Deity*, expressed his *wonder* with great *Reverence*, having no

Isa. 44. 16, 17.

Clem. Alexand. Protrept. p. 46.

Strom. 1. p. 304.

Plutarch in Numâ.

Varro apud Augustin. de Civit. Dei, l. 4. c. 31.

Philo de legat. ad Caium p. 1035.

mean skill in *Philoſophy*. So that we ſee the wiſeſt perſons, who had no ſuch *Law* from *God* to direct them, yet by the bare uſe of reaſon did agree in the thing it ſelf, that it was unſuitable to the Divine Nature to Worſhip *God* by any Images or viſible repreſentations of him. From hence we have reaſon to ſuppoſe, among the more ancient Nations who kept nearer to the dictates of Natural Reaſon, the Worſhip of *Images* was almoſt generally rejected. So *Bardeſanes* in *Euſebius* ſaith of the moſt Eaſtern Countries then known; of the *Seres* and the *Brachmanus*; So *Herodotus*, *Strabo*, *Diogenes Laertius* ſay of the *Perſians*: So *Tacitus* of the *Germans*, that they rejected Images, *becauſe they thought them unſuitable to the greatneſs of their Deities*. So *Lucian* likewiſe ſaith of the moſt ancient *Egyptians*; and Hiſtorians agree of the *Romans*, as we have already ſeen. If all this had been a meer poſitive *Law* intended only for the *Jews*, becauſe of their dulneſs and ſtupidity, as ſome imagine, whence comes it to paſs that thoſe who never heard of this Law yet judged ſuch a way of Worſhip to be wholly unbecoming a Divine Nature? It was not meerly the fear leſt they ſhould worſhip the Images themſelves for *Gods*, which was the reaſon of the Commandment, but the incongruity of ſuch a way of Worſhip to a Being ſuppoſed to be of an infinite and ſpiritual nature.

Euſebius de prepar. Evang. l. 6. c. 10. Herodot. l. 1. Strabo l. 15. Diog. Laert. proœm. Tacit. de morib. German. c. 9. Lucian. de Dea Syria. init.

The reaſon of this Law more clear by the Goſpel.

§. 7. And it ſeems of all things the moſt ſtrange to me, that any perſon ſhould think this Precept only reſpected the *Jewiſh Oeconomy*; and that

that now under the *Gospel* where we have clearer discoveries of *Gods* spiritual nature and worship, that we should be left at liberty to do that, which was before, unlawful to be done. Was it inconsistent with *Gods* nature then, and is it less so now, when we understand his nature much better? and that is given as a particular reason why we ought to Worship him *after a spiritual manner*; and not by any *corporeal representation* as the *Jews* say the *Samaritans* Worshipped *God* in the form of a *Dove* in their Temple on Mount *Garizim*: in which, notwithstanding what *Morinus* saith, there seems to be no improbability, not only from our *Saviours* words, and the occasion of speaking them to a *Samaritan* woman (which we do not find he insisted on so much to the *Jews* as being then free from this kind of *Idolatry*) and the constant tradition of the *Jews*; but from the nature of the *Samaritan* Religion which they received from the ten Tribes, which Worshipped *God* under *Images* (as will appear afterwards) and the agreeableness of the Symbol of a *Dove* to the name of *Semiramis* and their *Assyrian* off-spring among whom the *Dove* was accounted Sacred. But however this be, since the reason of this command, drawn from the invisible and spiritual nature of *God*, is now enforced upon us by the *Gospel*, as the ground of giving *Spiritual Worship* to God; how can any men in their senses imagine that Worship to be lawful among *Christians* which was unlawful to the *Jews*? Is it, that there is now no danger of falling into *Heathen Idolatry*,

John 4. 23, 24.

Morinus in Pentateuch. Samarit. Exerc. 1. S. 9. c. 5.

as there was among the *Jews*, on which account *God* tied them up so strictly in this point of *Images*? But this is to beg the Question, and to take it for granted, that there was no other reason of this Command; whereas *God* himself hath told us another, and that is, the incongruity of it to his infinite nature; which the very *Heathens* themselves apprehended in this case. I grant *God* might by this means design to keep them at the greatest distance from the *Heathen Idolatry*; but that doth not hinder, but there was an evil in the thing it self, as it doth imply so great a disparagement of the Divine Nature to be worshipped by a corporeal representation. As we may say that the prohibition of common *Swearing* was intended by *God* to keep men from *perjury*; but besides that, it implies so great an irreverence of *God*, that it is evil without that further respect. And can any one imagine, there should be greater irreverence of *God* shewn in calling him to witness upon every slight occasion, than there is in bowing down before a block or a hewen stone representing *God* to my mind by it? What can such an Image do to the heightning of devotion, or raising affections? if it be by calling to my mind that *Being* I am to worship, then there must be supposed some *likeness*, or *Analogy*, or *Union* between the object represented and the image, every one of which tends highly to the dishonour of the *Deity*, and suggests mean thoughts to us of the *God* we are to worship. And is there no danger among Christians, that they should entertain too

low

low and unworthy thoughts of God? and can any thing tend to it more effectually, than the bringing down the representations of him to the figure and lineaments of a Man, drawn upon a Table, or carved in an *Image?* On which account, it seems much more reasonable for me to Worship *God* by prostrating my self to the Sun, or any of the Heavenly bodies, nay to an Ant or a Fly, than to a picture or an Image: For in the other I see great evidences of the power, and wisdom and goodness of God, which may suggest venerable apprehensions of *God* to my mind; whereas these can have nothing worthy admiration, unless it be the skill of the Painter or Artificer? And I cannot for my heart, understand; why I may not as well, nay better, burn Incense and say my Prayers to the Sun, having an intention only to honour the true *God* by it, as to do both those to an *Image:* I am sure the *Sun* hath far more advantages, than any artificial Image can have; the beauty and influence of it may inflame and warm ones devotions much more. If the danger be, that I am more like to take the *Sun* for *God* than an Image; on that account, that which deserves most honour should have least given it, and that which deserves least should have most. For the danger is there still greater, where the excellency is greater, and by that means we ought rather to Worship a beast than a *Saint*, for there is less danger of believing one to be God than the other; and so the *Ægyptians* were more excusable than the *Papists*. I must ingenuously confess, if I had been an *Heathen*

Idolater,

Idolater, only upon ſuch principles as theſe, that there is one ſupreme infinite *Being*, who makes uſe of ſome more illuſtrious Beings of the world, to communicate benefits to the reſt; on which account, I thought my ſelf bound to teſtifie the honour I owe to the ſupreme *Deity*, by paying my devotions in ſubordination to him, to thoſe ſubſervient and miniſterial *Gods*; I ſhould not have been afraid, of what any *Papiſts* in the World could have ſaid for my Confutation. Nay, I ſhould have been tempted to have laughed at their folly and deſpiſed their weakneſs, who ſhould plead for the worſhip of *God* in or by a dull and rude image, and condemn me for honouring *God* in the moſt noble parts of the Creation? If they had told me, *that the ſupreme God, muſt have a worſhip proper to himſelf*; Yes, I ſhould anſwer them in their own terms, I by no means queſtion it, and that is it, which is called λατρεία, which is reſerved to the ſupreme Deity, all that I give to inferiour *Deities*, is but δουλεία, only the *Sun* deſerved an ὑπερδουλεία, becauſe of his eminent uſefulneſs. If they had ſaid, *I made them Gods, by giving them religious Worſhip:* no more, than they do Images. If yet they had urged, *that God had forbidden Worſhipping the Hoſt of Heaven*; Yes, that is, giving the Worſhip to the Supreme *God* to them, but not a ſubordinate relative, inferiour Worſhip, which was all I intended; and I hope they are not ſo ignorant of the nature of humane actions, as not to know that they go whither they are intended; and my intent was only to honour the true God by it: or elſe, that the

Wor-

Worshipping the Host of Heaven was forbidden to the dull and stupid *Jews*, who had no kind of *Philosophy* in them, and did not see those admirable Images of the Divine perfections in them which I did; but for men of Philosophical and contemplative minds, what injury to *God* could there be, as long as the more I saw cause to honour these, far greater I still saw to honour him who produced all these things? or lastly, I would appeal to themselves whether the precept against *Worshipping the host of Heaven*, or *images* were more plain in the *Scripture?* the second commandment is not in words against the Worship of the *things* but the *images* of them, and the first against Worshipping them as the *Supreme God*; I did neither; but they could not possibly excuse themselves who did the same things to an Image, which they do to *God* himself. Thus we see the reason of the commandment is by no means appropriated to the *Jews*, but doth extend as far as the knowledge of it doth: and the same arguments which notwithstanding that command would justifie the Worship of Images, will likewise justifie the most early, the most general, the most lasting *Idolatry* of the World, which is the Worship of the Sun, Moon, and Starrs. And a mighty Argument that the reason of this command, drawn from the unsuitableness of the Worship of Images to the nature of God is of an unalterable and universal nature, is, that the same reason is urged under the New Testament against the *Idolatry* of the *Heathens*. So St. *Paul* dealt with the *Athenians*, proving

proving the unreaſonableneſs of their Worſhip-
Act. 17. ping *God* by *Images*, becauſe *he was the God that*
24, 25. *made the World and is Lord of Heaven and*
Earth, and that we are his off-ſpring, therefore we
29. *ought not to think that the God-head is like unto*
Gold or Silver, or Stone graven by art or mans de-
vice: he doth not ſpeak meerly againſt their other objects of Worſhip beſides the true *God*, nor their ſuppoſing their *Gods* to be preſent in their Images, nor taking their images for *Gods*, but againſt their ſuppoſition that there was any reſemblance between *God* and their *Images*, or that he was capable of receiving any honour by
Rom. 1. 19. them. The ſame Argument he uſeth to the *Romans*, ſpeaking of thoſe, *in whom that which*
may be known of God is manifeſt, even his eter-
21. *nal power and God-head*; yet theſe perſons *who*
knew God, did not glorifie him as God, but chang-
ed the glory of the incorruptible God into an
23. *Image made like to corruptible man*, &c. where *changing his glory into Images*, is immediately oppoſed to *the glorifying him as God*, in reſpect of his *eternal power and God-head*; ſo that thoſe two are inconſiſtent with each other, to *glorifie God* by an *Image* and to *glorifie him as God*. For here the Apoſtle doth not diſcourſe againſt the moſt groſs and ſottiſh *Idolaters* of the *Heathens*, but as St. *Chryſoſtome* well obſerves againſt the *Philoſophers* and the *wiſeſt* among them: Who, though they differed in their opinions of *Religion* extremely from the *Vulgar*, yet they concurred with them in all the external practices of their *Idolatry*. And therefore the *Apoſtle* doth not charge them

with

with false notions of a *Deity*, for he saith, *they held the truth in unrighteousness*; *that they knew God*, but they shewed their vanity and folly in thinking they had found out subtiller wayes of defending the common *Idolatries* among them, instead of opposing them, made use of their wits, to excuse them. And the most intelligent *Heathens* did never look on their *Images* as any other, than *symbols* or *representations* of that Being to which they gave divine Worship. *No one but a Fool thinks otherwise of them*, saith *Celsus*; *They are only Books for the ignorant* saith *Porphyrie*, and the *Heathens* in *Athanasius*. They deny, in *Arnobius*, *that they ever thought their Images to be gods, or to have any* Divinity *in them, but what only comes from their Consecration, to such an Use*; and in St. *Augustin*, *that they Worshipped the Images themselves, but through them they Worshipped the Deity*; *Maximus Tyrius* discourses largely on this Subject, and shews, *that Images were but the signs of divine honour, and helps to remembrance. They are but Symbols of the presence of the Gods*, saith *Julian*; *We do not think them Gods*, saith he, *but that through them we may Worship the Deity*; *for we being in the body, ought to perform our Service in a way agreeable to it.* And *Eusebius* testifies in general of the *Heathens*, *that they did not look on their Images as Gods*; however some among them had an opinion of the Gods being incorporated in them. I desire to know whether these men who worshipped Images upon those grounds did amiss or no in it? I do not ask, whether they

V. 18. 21.

Celsus apud Origen. l. 7. p. 373. Euseb. de prepar. at. Evang. l. 3. c. 7. Athanas. c. Gent. p. 24--31. Arnob. c. Gent. l. 6. p. 103. August. Tom 8. in Psal. 113. Maxim. Tyrius dissert. 38. Julian. op. frag. ep. ed. Petavii p. 537. Euseb. prepar. Evang. l. 4 c. 1.

they were mistaken as to the *objects* of their Worship; but on supposition they were not, whether they were to blame in the manner of serving *God* by Images, in such a way as they describe? If not, wherefore doth St. *Paul* pitch upon that, to condemn them for, which they were not at all to blame in? He ought to have done as the *Jesuits* in *China* did, who never condemned the people for worshipping Images, but for worshipping false *Gods* by them; and perswaded them not to lay them aside, but to convert them to the honour of the true *God*; and so melted down their former Images, and made new ones of them. Can we imagine St. *Paul* meant the same thing, when he blames men not for believing them to be *Gods*, but that *God* could be worshipped *by the work of mens hands*; and for *changing thereby the glory due to God* in regard of his infinite and incorruptible being, *into mean and unworthy Images* thinking thereby to give honour to him.

Trigaut. de Christian. Expedit. apud Sinas, l. 5. c. 16. p. 588.

The Christian Church believed this Law immutable.

§. 8. And upon these grounds the Primitive *Fathers* disputed against the *Heathen Idolatry*; for, *the making use of corporeal representations makes the Deity contemptible*, saith *Clemens* of *Alexandria*. *Origen* saith, *That Christians have nothing to do with Images, because of the second Commandment; and on that account will rather dye, than defile themselves with them: and that it is impossible any one that knows God, should pray to them. That it is no sufficient excuse to say, they do not take them for Gods, but only for symbols or representations of them, for they must*

Clem. Alex. Strom. 5. p. 559. Origen. c. Celf l. 7. p 375. L. 6 p. 284.

be

be ignorant, mean, and unlearned persons, who can imagine the work of an Artificer can be any representation of a Deity. It would be too tedious at this time to transcribe all the invectives in the Writings of the *Fathers* upon this subject: where they dispute against the *Heathens* from this argument, and do still suppose the force of the reason of this Law, to oblige *Christians* as much as ever it did the *Jews*; but I purposely forbear, only taking notice that after the worship of *Images* came in, with the decay of the Primitive Piety and Learning in the *Eastern Churches*, yet the great defenders of them still declared their abhorrence of any representation of the *Divine Nature*. So *Germanus Patriarch* of *Constantinople* in his Epistles, yet extant in the actions of that wise Synod at *Nice*; *We make*, saith he, *no kind of Image, or similitude, or figure, or representation of the invisible Deity*; and *that the meaning of the Commandment of the Law against Images was, that the Divine Nature was invisible and incomprehensible, and like to nothing we see, and that we ought not to entertain any corporeal conceptions of God.* And *Damascen* saith expressly, *That it is the highest madness and impiety to go about to make an Image of God*: i. e. saith *Clichtovæus*, *so as to think any Image to be like unto God, or able perfectly to represent him to us*; which is likewise *Bellarmins* answer: as though ever any men were such fools to believe an Image could perfectly represent an infinite Being; or that *God* need to make a Law to forbid that, which is utterly impossible in the very nature of the thing;

Synod. Nic. 2. Act. 4. Ep. ad Johan. Synod. Ad Thom. Claudiop. Ep. ibid. Damascen. Orthod. fid. l. 4. c. 17.

thing; he might more reaſonablely forbid men to paint a ſound, to graſp all the Air in the hollow of their hands, to drink up the Ocean, to wear the *Sun* for a *Pendant* at their ears, or to make new worlds, than to command them not to make any Image which ſhould perfectly repreſent his Nature: And yet of this kind of Image alone of the true *God*, *Bellarmine* underſtands the prohibition of the *Law*, and the ſayings before mentioned; but *all other*, he ſaith, *were allowed by both, whether by way of Hiſtory or analogical reſemblance, or the faſhion of a man wherein he hath appeared: i. e.* all poſſible repreſentations of *God* are allowed, and only that which is impoſſible forbidden. But this anſwer is not more weak and trifling, than contrary to the meaning of *Germanus*, *Tharaſius*, or the reſt of the *Nicene Fathers*; who do acknowledge, there was no ground to make any Images with reſpect to the *Divine Nature*, till the incarnation of Chriſt; but ſince God appeared in humane nature, there is no incongruity in repreſenting that by an Image, and by that to give honour to the inviſible *Godhead*, as long as they preſerve the true belief concerning the Deity; and conſequently may honour *God*, by giving worſhip to the *Images* of thoſe *Saints*, whom they believe to be in Heaven with God.

Bellarm. de Imag. l. 2. cap. 8.

Of the Doctrine of the ſecond Council of *Nice*.

§. 9. This is the ſubſtance of the Doctrine of the ſecond *Council* of *Nice*; which they juſtifie by fabulous ſtories, and impertinent citations, and inſufficient anſwers. For, when the *Fathers* of the *Synod* at *Conſtantinople* had

had ſaid, "that *Chriſt* came to deliver us from "all *Idolatry*, and to teach the worſhip of *God* "in Spirit and in truth; they bravely anſwer, *That then it is impoſſible for Chriſtians to fall into Idolatry, becauſe Chriſts Kingdom was alwayes to continue, and the gifts and graces of God are without repentance.* Which would as well hold againſt the prevalency of the *Turk*, as Idolatry among them. Thoſe *Fathers* urge, "That the *Devil* now, not being able to re-"duce the world to the former *Idolatry*, en-"deavours under hand to introduce it, under a "pretence of *Chriſtianity*, bringing them again "to the worſhip of the creature, and making a "*God* of a thing that is made, when they have "called it by the name of *Chriſt*. Theſe anſwer, *That it is true, the Fathers uſed that Argument againſt the* Arrians, *who ſuppoſed Chriſt to be a Creature, and they grant that they were guilty of Idolatry in giving Divine worſhip to Chriſt, when they believed him to be a creature; but the difference lyes herein, that the* Arrians *truſted in Chriſt, and gave properly divine honour to him, which they ſay, they did not to the Images, but only worſhipped them for the ſake of the object repreſented by them.* But *Aquinas* and his followers have at large proved, that where any thing is worſhipped, meerly for the ſake of another, it muſt have the ſame kind of worſhip given it, which they give to the thing repreſented by it: for as *Aquinas* obſerves, the motion of the ſoul towards an Image is twofold: either as it is a thing, or as it is an Image: the firſt, he ſaith is diſtinct from that

Synod. Nicen. 2. Act. 6.

Aquinas Summ. p. 3. q. 25. art. 3.

motion which reſpects the object; but the ſecond is the ſame; ſo that to the Image of *Chriſt*, as made of *Wood or Stone*, no worſhip at all is given: and therefore it being given meerly on the account of its being an Image, it neceſſarily follows, that the ſame worſhip muſt be given to the Image, which is given to *Chriſt* himſelf. And ſo they are in the ſame caſe with the *Arrians*, whom they acknowledge to be *Idolaters*; notwithſtanding their *Chriſtianity*, or *that the gifts and graces of God are without repentance.* Beſides, the *Conſtantinopolitan Fathers* urge "The great abſurdity of making an Image of "*Chriſt*, for worſhip, becauſe *Chriſt* is *God and* "*man*; therefore the Image muſt be of *God* "*and Man*, which cannot be, unleſs the *Deity* "be circumſcribed within the created fleſh, "or there be a confuſion of both natures after "their union, both which are blaſphemies "condemned by the *Church*. The *Nicene Fathers* in anſwer to this yield, *That the Name Chriſt is ſignificative of both natures, and that an Image can only repreſent the viſible humane nature, and that it agrees only in name, and not in ſubſtance with the thing repreſented:* and after many reviling expreſſions againſt their adverſaries, (no argument of the goodneſs of their cauſe) they ſay, *that if the Divine nature were circumſcribed within the humane nature in the Cradle, and on the Croſs, then it is in an image; if not in one, neither is it in the other.* But what doth this anſwer ſignifie, unleſs there be an equal preſence and union of the Divine nature of Chriſt with the Image, as there

was

was with the humane nature? Which union, was the reaſon of the *adoration* given to the *perſon* of *Chriſt*; and what ground can there be then of giving divine worſhip to the Image of *Chriſt*, unleſs the ſame *union* be ſuppoſed? If the humane nature without the union of the *divine*, could yield us no ſufficient reaſon of divine worſhip being given to it, how much leſs can an Image deſerve it, which can only at the beſt repreſent but the external lineaments of that humane nature? And if the divine nature be ſuppoſed united with the *Image*, then the ſame divine honour is due to the Image of *Chriſt*, which is to *God* himſelf, which yet theſe *Nicene Fathers* deny: and the Image then joyned with the divine nature, is as proper an object of divine worſhip without reſpect to any *Prototype*, as the perſon of *Chriſt* is conſiſting of the divine and humane nature. Again, they urge, "If the humane nature of *Chriſt* be re-"preſented in the Image of *Chriſt* to be wor-"ſhipped, as ſeparate from the divine, this "would be plain *Neſtorianiſm*. To this the good *Nicene Fathers*, not knowing what to anſwer, plainly deny the concluſion, and cry, *They Neſtorians? No, they lye in their teeth; they were no more* Neſtorians *than themſelves, nor ſo much neither*: And now, good men, they ſay, *It is true, they do repreſent Chriſt only by his humane nature in an Image; and when they look on Images, they underſtand nothing but what is ſignified by them; as when the birth of the Virgin is repreſented, they conceive in their minds, that he who was born, was truly God as well as*

man. Alas for them! that they ſhould ever be charged with the worſhip of Images! They plead for nothing now, but a help to their profound Meditations by them. But the Controverſie was about worſhip, what ever they think; and their Adverſaries argument did not lye in the Images being conſidered as an object of *perception*, but of *worſhip*: *i. e.* if the Image can only repreſent the humane nature of *Chriſt*, as ſeparate from the divine, and in that reſpect be an *object of worſhip* to us, then the charge of *Neſtorianiſm* follows; but this they very wiſely paſs by; and their diſtinction of *the Image from the principal*, cannot ſerve their turn, ſince the *Image* receiving the worſhip due to the *principal*, muſt have not only the *name*, (as they ſay) but the *reaſon* of *worſhip* common with the *principal* which it repreſents. After this, the *Fathers* of *Conſtantinople* proceed to another Argument, which is, "That all the repreſentation of *Chriſt* "allowed us by the *Goſpel*, is that which "*Chriſt* himſelf inſtituted, in the *Elements* of "the *Lords Supper*, whoſe uſe was to put us in "remembrance of *Chriſt*. No other Figure or "Type being choſen by *Chriſt* as able to repre"ſent his being in the fleſh, but this. This was "an *honourable Image* of his quickning *body*, "made by himſelf, *ſay they*; which he would "not have of the ſhape of a man to prevent "*Idolatry*; but of a common nature, as he "took upon him the common nature of man, "and not any individuated perſon; and as "the *body* of *Chriſt* was really ſanctified by

"the

"the divine nature; so by institution this holy "Image is made divine through sanctification "by Grace. Here the *Nicene Council* quarrels with them, *for calling the Eucharist an Image, contrary*, as they say, *to the Scriptures and Fathers*; but they are as much to be believed therein, as in their admirable proofs, that the worship of Images was the constant doctrine of the *Church*; and having strenuously denyed this, they suppose that to be enough to answer the argument.

Besides these particular arguments against the *Images* of *Christ*, the *Council* of *Constantinople* useth many more against the *Images* of any other, "Because these being the chief, there "can be less reason for any other besides; that "there is no tradition of *Christ* or his *Apostles*, "or the primitive *Fathers* for them; no way of "consecration of them prescribed, or practi-"sed; no suitableness in the use of them to "the design of *Christian Religion*, which being "in the middle between *Judaism* and *Paga-"nism*, it casts off the Sacrifices of the one, "and not only the *Sacrifices*, but all the *Idola-"tries* of the other: and it is blasphemy to the "*Saints* in Heaven, to call in the *Heathen* super-"stitions into *Christianity*, to honour them by: "that it is unbecoming their glory in Heaven, "to be set up on earth in dull and senseless "Images; that Christ himself would not re-"ceive testimony from *Devils*, though they "spake truth; neither can such a *Heathen-"ish* custome be acceptable to the *Saints* in "*Heaven*, though pretended to be for their

"honour. That nothing can be plainer in the "*Gospel*, than that *God is a Spirit*, and will be "worshipped in *Spirit and in truth*; to which "nothing can be more contrary, than the going "about to honour *God*, by worshipping any "Image of himself, or his *Saints*. These and many other arguments from the *Scriptures*, and *Fathers*, that *Council* insists upon, to shew the incongruity of the worship of *Images*, to the nature of God, and the design of the *Christian Religion*; to which the *Council* of *Nice* returns very weak and trivial answers, as shall more largely appear, if any one thinks good to defend them. And we have this apparent advantage on our side, that although the *Popes* of *Rome* sided with these worshippers of *Images*, yet the *Council* at *Francford*, called together by *Charles* the *Great* condemn'd them: Not out of misunderstanding their Doctrine, as some vainly imagine; *because* as *Vasquez* well proves, the Copy of the *Nicene Council* was sent to them by *Pope Adrian*; *because* the *Acts* of that *Council* were very well known to the Author of the Book, written upon this subject, under the name of *Charles* the Great, and published by *du Tillet* at *Paris*, about the middle of the last Century, which is acknowledged by their learnedst men to have been wtitten at the same time; *because* the *Popes Legats Theophylactus*, and *Stephanus* were present, and might easily rectifie any mistake, if they were guilty of it; and none of the *Historians* of that time, do take notice of any such *errour* among them. But *Vasquez* runs into another strange mistake himself, that the *Council*

Vasquez in l. 2. q. 25. disp. 107. c. 5.

of

of *Francford* did not condemn that of *Nice*; which is evident they did expreſly, by the ſecond *Canon* of that *Council* publiſhed by *Sirmondus*. And all the objections of *Vaſquez* are taken off by what *Sirmondus* ſpeaks, of the great authority and antiquity of that *MS.* from which he publiſhed them, and from the conſent of the Hiſtorians of that time, that the *Council* of *Franeford* did reject that of *Nice*: and *Sirmondus* ſaith, they had good reaſon to deny it to be an *Oecumenical Council*, where only the *Greeks* met together, and none of other *Provinces* were called, or asked their opinion, and *Pope Adrian* himſelf, he ſaith, in his defence of it againſt the *Caroline Books*, never gives it the name or authority of an *Oecumenical Council*. The ſame *Council* was rejected here in *England*, as our *Hiſtorians* tell us, *becauſe it aſſerted the adoration of Images, which the Church of God abhors*; which are the words of *Hoveden* and others. And we find afterwards in *France* by the *Synod* of *Paris*, called by *Ludovicus Pius* upon the Letters of *Michael Balbus Emperour* of *Conſtantinople*, in order to the *Union* of *Chriſtendome* in this point, that theſe *Weſtern Churches* perſiſted ſtill in the condemnation of the *Nicene Council*; which they would not have done, after ſo long a time to inform themſelves, if a meer miſtake of their Doctrine at firſt, had been the cauſe of their oppoſition. But whoſoever will read the *Caroline Books*, or the *Synod* of *Paris*, or *Agobardus* and others

Sirmond. Concil. Gall. To. 2. p. 194.

Spelman. Co c. Tom. 1. p 306. Hovedeni Annal. p. prior. ad A D. 792. Simeon Dunel. Hiſtor. p. 111. Matth. weſtmon. ad A D 793.

Caroli Caſtrul. de non adorandis imaginibus. Pariſ. A. D 1549. & in Goldaſti Conſtit. Imperial. To. 1. Synod. Pariſ. in Supplement. Concil Gall. ad A.D. 824. Agobardi opera Ed. Maſſoni & Baluzii.

about that time, will find that they condemn all religious worship of Images, as *adoration*, and contrary to that honour which is due to *God* alone, and to the commands which he hath given in *Scripture*. And I extremely wonder how any men of common sense, and much more any of learning and judgement, that had read the Book of *Charles* the *Great* against the *Nicene Synod*, could imagine it altogether proceeded upon a mistake of the meaning of it; when it so distinctly relates, and punctually answers, the several places of *Scriptures* and *Fathers* produced by it for the worship of Images. In the first Book an answer is given to many impertinent places of the Old Testament, alledged in that *Council*; which the second proceeds with, and examines several testimonies of the *Fathers*; and in the two remaining Books pursues all their pretences with that diligence, that no one can imagine all this while that the Author did not know their meaning. And that by *adoration* he means no more than giving *Religious Worship* to *Images* appears from hence, because he calls the Civil worship which men give to one another, by the name of *adoration*: when he shews, *that* it is another thing to give *adoration* to a man upon a *civil respect*, and to give *adoration* to *Images* upon a *religious account*, when *God* challenges all *religious worship* or *adoration* to himself: and whatever reason will hold for such a worship of *Images* wil much more hold for the worship of *men*, who have greater excellency in them, and more honour put upon

Caroli liber de Imag. l. 2. c. 24.

upon them by *God*, than any Images can ever pretend to. That *God* allows no other kind of adoration to be given to any but himself, but that which we give to one another. Can any be so senseless to think, that by this *civil adoration*, he meant, we honored every man we met as our *Sovereign Prince?* And as little reason is there to say, that by *adoration* given to Images, he meant only the incommunicable worship due only to *God*, in the sense of those *Fathers*. *Can we imagine*, saith he, *that S.* Peter *would allow the worship of Images, who forbad* Cornelius *to worship him! Or S.* John, *whom the Angel checked for offering to worship him, and bid him give that honor to God? Or* Paul *and* Barnabas, *who with such horror ran among the men of* Lycaonia, *when they were about to to worship them; and yet, surely Angels and such persons as these, deserved more to be worshipped than any Images can do. But we see by these examples, that even these are not to be adored with any other kind of adoration, than what the offices of civility require from us.* Besides in his language, those who followed the *Council* of *Constantinople* are said, not to *adore Images*; by which nothing else can be meant, than their giving no *Religious worship* to them; and when he shews the great inconsequence of the Argument from the *adoration* of the *Statues* of the *Emperours* to the *adoration* of *Images*, because in matters of *Religious Worship* we are not to follow the customs of men against the will of God; he thereby shews what kind of *adoration* he intended, not the worship of

c. 25.

c. 31.

L. 3. c. 15.

Latria,

Latria, but ſuppoſed to be of an inferior ſort. In ſo much, that *Binius* confeſſeth, *that the deſign of theſe books was againſt all worſhip of Images*. It is true, *Pope Hadrian* in the anſwer he ſent to theſe Books, which is ſtill extant in the *Tomes* of the *Councils*, doth deny that the *Synod* intended to give *proper divine worſhip* to *Images*; but that is no more than the *Synod* it ſelf had in words ſaid before; but that was not the *Queſtion* what *they ſaid*, but what the nature of the *thing* did imply? Whether that *religious worſhip* they gave to *Images* was not part of that *adoration* which was only due to God? And he that expects an anſwer to this from him, will find himſelf deceived; for he is ſo pitifully put to it for an anſwer to the demand of any *example* or words of the *Apoſtles* to juſtifie *Image-worſhip*, that he is forced to make uſe of ſome Myſtical paſſages of *Dionyſius* the ſuppoſed *Areopagite*, wherein the word *Image* hapning to be, is very ſufficient to his purpoſe. And this anſwer of *Hadrians* gave ſo little ſatisfaction to the *Weſtern Biſhops*, that *A. D.* 824. the *Synod* at *Paris*, being called by *Ludovicus Pius* to adviſe about this point, did condemn expreſly *Pope Hadrian* for aſſerting a *ſuperſtitious adoration of Images*; which they look on as a *great impiety*, and ſay that he produces very impertinent places of the *Fathers*, and remote from his purpoſe; and that ſetting aſide his *Pontifical Authority*, in his anſwer to the *Caroline Books*, there were ſome things apparently falſe: and they have nothing to excuſe him by, but his *Ignorance*. And there-

Concil. Tom. 5. p. 553.

Tom. 6. p. 143.

C. 36.

Delaland Supplem. Concil. Gal. p. 109.

therefore they at large shew, that the *Religious worship* of *Images* came first from *Hereticks*; and that it was always condemned by the *Fathers* of the *Christian Church*: and answer the Arguments produced on the other side out of the Writings of the *Fathers*. And supposing that superstitious custom of worshipping Images, had for some time obtained, yet they shew by several testimonies, that it ought to be abrogated. No wonder then that *Bellarmine* is so much displeased with this *Synod*, for offering so boldly to censure the *Popes Writings*, and a *Synod* approved by him: wherein he saith, they exceed the fault of the *Author of the Caroline Books: beeause*, as he confesseth, *they offered to teach the Pope, and resisted him to the face*. And yet, no doubt, they had read and considered *Hadrians* words, wherein he disowns *the giving true divine honour to Images*. Not long after this *Synod*, came forth the Book of *Agobardus*, *Archbishop* of *Lyons*, against *Images*; occasioned, saith *Papirius Massonus*, *by the stupendous superstition in that Age in the worship of them*. And this, saith he, is the substance of his Doctrine, out of S. *Augustine* and other *Fathers*; *that* there is no other Image of *God*, but what is himself, and therefore cannot be painted, and he ought not to be worshipped in any Image, but what he hath prescribed us to worship, which is *Christ*; *that adoration* is external or internal; *that*, both of them are called *Religion*, by which we are bound eternally to *God*, and *only* to him: from whence it follows, that neither *Angels* nor

Bellarm. Append. ad lib. de cultu Imag. c. 3.

c. 4.

Saints

Saints are to be worſhipped by any *Religious worſhip*: for this is the *Law* of *Adoration*, that no creature, no phantaſm of *God* in our minds, no work of mens hands ought to be worſhipped: for if *Gods* creatures are not to be worſhipped, much leſs ours, ſuch as *Images* of *God*, *Angels* and *Saints* are. Neither is it enough to ſay, that they do not worſhip the *Image*, but the *thing* repreſented; for the object terminates the worſhip, and it is a deceit of the *Devil* under the pretence of honoring the *Saints*, to bring mens minds to *Idols*, and from the true *God* to carnal things: *that Images* are to be uſed only for ſhew and memory, and not at all for *Religion*; that *God* alone is to be worſhipped with all *Religious worſhip*, whether called *Latria* or *Doulia*, or what name ſoever; and for the caſting away all ſuperſtition, that no *Images* be painted in *Churches*, no *Statues* erected, nor accounted holy, that the *true God* may be worſhipped alone for ever. This is the abſtract of his Doctrine delivered by *Maſſonus*, whoſe other Writings ſhew he was far from being partial towards the *Reformation*. And the Book it ſelf is lately publiſhed by *Baluzius* again, where any one may eaſily ſatisfie himſelf concerning his fidelity. But *Baluzius* very honeſtly tells us, ſome have ſuſpected this Book not to be very *Catholick*: and therefore it was cenſured by *Baronius* and the *Spaniſh Index*; yet he ingenuouſly confeſſeth, he ſaith no more than the whole *Gallican Church* believed in that *Age*. *What* that was, I have already ſhewed. This I have the more largely

Agobardi op. ra p. 221. Ed. 1666.

largely insisted upon, to shew, that it is no new thing for us to plead for all *Religious worship* being appropriated to *God*; and that the command against *Image-worship* was no Ceremonial *Law*, respecting mearly the *Jews*, but that the reason of it doth extend to all *Ages* and Nations, and especially to us who live under the *Gospel*. From all which it follows, that it was not mearly the *Heathen Idolatry* which was forbidden by God, nor was this *Law* given barely to prevent, their falling to that by degrees, but the giving to himself such a Worthip, which he judges so unworthy of him.

§. 10. 3. From those who were best able to *understand* the meaning of it. We can imagine none so competent a Judge of the meaning of a *Law*, as the *giver* of it; and he afterwards declares the sense of this Law. The first occasion given for knowing the meaning of the *Law* concerning Images, was not long after the making of it; when upon *Moses* his absence, they compelled *Aaron* to make them a *Golden Calf*. Here was an *Image* made contrary to the *Law*, as is on all sides acknowledged; but the question is, Whether by this the *Israelites* did fall into the *Heathen Idolatry*, or only worship the true *God* under that *Symbol* of his presence? That they did not herein fall back to the *Heathen Idolatry*, I thus prove: 1. From the *occasion* of it, which was not upon the least pretence of *Infidelity* as to the true *God*; or that they had now better reason given them, *for the worship of other Gods*

Of the Scripture Instances of Idolatry contrary to the second *Commandment*.

Exo. 32. 4.

Gods beſides him: but all they ſay, was, *that* Moſes *had been ſo long abſent, they knew not what was become of him, and therefore they ſay to* Aaron, *make us Gods* (or *a God*, as in *Neh.* 9. 18.) *to go before us.* We cannot imagine the people ſo ſottiſh, to deſire *Aaron* to make them a *God* in the proper ſenſe; as though they could believe the *Calf* newly made, to have been the *God*, which before it was made, *brought them out of the Land of Egypt*, as they ſay afterwards, *v.* 4: but it muſt be underſtood as the *ſymbol* of that *God* which did bring them from thence. The controverſie then lies here, Whether they thought the *Egyptian Gods* delivered them out of *Egypt*, while they forſook all their own Worſhippers, to preſerve thoſe who were ſo great enemies to them, that their very *way* of *worſhip* was an *abomination to all the Egyptians*, and whether they could think *the Gods of Egypt* had wrought all the Miracles for them, in their deliverance, and after it? Whether they appeared not long before on *Mount Sinai*, and delivered the *Law* to them? Or, whether it were not the true *God* they meant, who had made that the Preface to his *Laws*, *I am the God that brought thee out of the Land of Egypt*, to whom they intended ſtill to give honor: But the only queſtion was concerning the *ſymbol* of his preſence, that was to go before them. For which, we are to conſider, that immediately before *Moſes* his going up into the Mount, the laſt promiſe *God* made to them was, *that he would ſend his Angel before them*; which is elſwhere called *his preſence*. Moreover, they underſtood

Exod. 8. 26.

Exod. 23. 20, 23.

Exo. 33 34.

derſtood that there ſhould be ſome extraordinary *ſymbol* of this preſence; but what it was, they could not tell; for *Moſes* was then gone into the Mount to learn: but he not being heard of in forty days, they took it for granted, they ſhould never hear of him any more; therefore they fall upon deviſing among themſelves, what was the fitteſt *ſymbol* for the preſence of *God* going before them; and herein the greateſt number being poſſeſſed with the prejudices of their education in *Egypt*, where *golden Bulls* were the ſymbols of their chief *God Oſiris*, they pitch upon that, and force *Aaron* to a compliance with them in it. 2. There is no intimation given in the whole ſtory, that they fell into the *Heathen Idolatry*; for when afterwards they fell into it, the particular names of the *Gods* are mentioned, as *Baal-peor*, *Moloch*, *Remphan*. But here on the contrary, *Aaron* expreſly proclaims *a feaſt to the Lord*, and the people accordingly met, and offered their accuſtomed offerings; whereas if it had been the *Egyptian Idolatry*, their common Sacrifices were abominations; they muſt not have ſacrificed *Sheep* and *Oxen*, as they were wont to do. And that it was not the *Idolatry* of other Nations, who worſhipped *the Hoſt of Heaven*, is plain from S. *Stephens* words, *And they made a Calf in thoſe days, and offered Sacrifice unto Idols, and rejoyced in the works of their own hands; then God turned, and gave them up to worſhip the Hoſt of Heaven.* Whereby it is both obſervable that the *Idolatry* of the *Calf* was diſtinct from the other *Heathen Idolatry*,

Num. 25. 3. Acts 7. 43. Exod 32. 5. Verſ. 6.

Acts 7. 41, 42.

latry, this being a puniſhment of the other; and withal, though the *Calf* was intended by them, to be only a ſymbol of *Gods* preſence, yet being directly againſt *Gods Command*, and having Divine worſhip given it, it is by S. *Stephen* called an *Idol*; and to the ſame purpoſe the *Pſalmiſt* ſpeaks, *They made a Calf in Horeb, and worſhipped the Molten Image; thus they changed their glory* (or rather *his*) *into the ſimilitude of an Ox that eateth graſs.* Which certainly was *Idolatry*, as well as that S. Paul charges the *Romans* with, *viz. that they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four footed beaſts, and creeping things.* And we ſee how highly *God* was diſpleaſed with the *Iſraelites*, for this ſin of the *golden Calf*, Exod. 32. 7,8,9,10.

Pſal. 106. 19, 20.

Rom. 1. 23.

The ſame may be ſaid, of the *two Calves* of *Jeroboam*, at *Dan* and *Bethel*; for it was neither agreeable to his end, nor ſo likely to ſucceed, to take the *ten Tribes* off from the *Worſhip* of the true *God*, but only from the place of it at *Hieruſalem*; and the occaſion of the *Kingdoms* coming to him was from *Solomons* falling to *Heathen Idolatry*: Which would make him more cautious of falling into it, eſpecially at his firſt entrance: And when the *Gods* of other Nations are mentioned, they are particularly deſcribed, as *Aſhtoreth* of the *Zodonians*, *Chemoſh* of the *Moabites*, and *Milcom* of the *Children of Ammon*. And in *Ahabs Idolatry*, the occaſion and deſcription of it is given: But of *Jeroboam* it is only ſaid *that he ſet up the Calves at*

1 Kings 11. 33.

Ibid.

1 Kin. 16. 31.

1 King. 12. 28, 29.

Dan

Dan *and* Bethel, *and said unto the people, It is too much for you to go up to* Hierusalem, *behold thy Gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the Land of* Egypt. How easie had it been to have said that *Jeroboam* Worshipped the *Gods* of *Egypt*, if that had been his intention? but, how much better that *he then* argued, that they had been hitherto in a great mistake concerning the *true God*, and not meerly as to the place of his Worship, which is all he speaks against: for he continued the same Feasts and way of Worship, which were at *Hierusalem*. 1 King. 12. 32. Besides, how comes the sin of *Ahab* to be so much greater than that of *Jeroboam*, if if they were both guilty of the same *Apostasie* to *Heathen Idolatry*? How came the Worship of the true *God* in the Ten Tribes to be set in opposition to *Heathen Idolatry*? how comes *Jehu* at the same time to boast *his zeal for the Lord*, when it is said of him, *that he departed not from the sins of* Jeroboam, *viz. The golden Calves of* Dan *and* Bethel? Lastly, how comes the Worship of the true *God* to be preserved in the Ten Tribes after their Captivity, when they still continued their separation in *Religion* from the *Kingdom* of *Judah*? For, certainly, if the *Samaritans* had only desired information concerning the Worship of the *God* of *Israel*, after the way of *Hierusalem*, they would have sent only thither for it; but because they sent into the *Land* of their *Captivity*, for a *Priest* to be sent to them; it is plain the former differences still continued; and yet it is said, *he taught them to*

1 King. 31. 1 King. 18. 21. 2 Kin. 10. 16, 29. 2 King. 17. 28.

fear the Lord. And notwithstanding it be thus evident, that *Jeroboam* did not fall then into *Heathen Idolatry*, yet we see that he is charged with *Idolatry* in Scripture; for it is said, *that he had done evil above all that were before him, and had gone and made him other Gods and Molten Images to provoke God to anger, and had cast him behind his back.* From whence it necessarily follows, that if *God* may be allowed to interpret his own *Law*, the Worshipping of *Images*, though designed for his honor is *Idolatry*.

1 Kin. 14. 9.

And since the *Lawgiver* hath thus interpeted his own *Law*, we need not be solicitous about the sense of any others; yet herein we have the concurrence of the *Jewish* and *Christian Church*: the *Jews* have thought the prohibition to extend to all kinds of *Images* for Worship, and almost all for *ornament*: and the Image-worship of the *Church* of *Rome* is one of the great scandals to this day, which hinder them from embracing *Christianity*. The primitive *Christians* were declared enemies to all Worship of *God* by *Images*; but I need the less to go about to prove it now, since it is at last confessed by one of the most learned *Jesuits* they ever had, that *for the four first Centuries and further, there was little or no use of Images in the Temples or Oratories of Christians*; but we need not their favour in so plain a cause as this; as shall be evidently proved if occasion be further given. And against my Adversaries opinon, *that the second Command only forbids the Worship of Idols*, we have the consent of

Petav. dogmat. Theol. To. 5 l. 15. c. 13 s. 3. c. 14. s. 8.

some

some of the most learned Writers of his own Church: For *Vasquez* acknowledgeth, *that it is plain in Scripture that God did not only forbid that in the second Command, which was unlawful by the Law of Nature, as the Worshipping an Image for God; but the Worshipping of the true God by any similitude of him*; and he reckons up many others, of the same opinion with him, of great estimation in the *Roman Church*. *Vasquez in 3. Thom. disp. 94. q. 25. c. 3.*

§. 11. But we must now consider, what he farther produces for his opinion; he therefore saith, *If S. Austins judgement be to be followed, the second Commandment is but a part or explication of the first.* But why doth he not tell us, whether *S. Austins* judgement be to be followed or no, if it be of so much consequence to the resolving of this Controversie? Nay how is he sure this was *S. Austins* constant judgement, since in his latter Writings, he reckons up the Commandments as others of the *Fathers* had done before him? But if *S. Austins* judgement were to be followed in this, doth it thence follow that this Commandment must be only against *Idols*? no, but that all things concerning the Worship of *God* must be in one command; and so they may be, and yet be as full against *Image-worship*, as in *two*: so, that no relief is to be had from hence. Of the distinctions used to excuse this from being Idolatry. *Aug. c. duas Ep. Pel. l. 3. c. 4.*

And as little from his distinction *of an inferior and relative honour only, which is given by them* (he saith) *to the Sacred Images of Christ, and the B. Mother and Saints; and that which they call Latria or Worship due to God alone the*

former, he ſaith, *is only honorary adoration, expreſſed by putting off our Hats, kiſſing them, or kneeling before them.* Which is juſt as if an unchaſte Wife ſhould plead in her excuſe to her Husband, that the perſon ſhe was too kind with, was extremely like him, and a near friend of his, and that it was out of reſpect to him that ſhe gave him the honour of his bed; Can any one think that ſuch an excuſe as this would be taken by a jealous Husband? How much leſs will ſuch like pretences avail with that God, who hath declared himſelf particularly *jealous* of his honour, in this Command above others, and that *he will not give his glory to another*; but hath reſerved all *Divine worſhip* as peculiar to himſelf; and no ſuch fond excuſes of *relative*, *inferiour*, and *improper Worſhip* will ſerve, when they encroach upon his Prerogative. It was well obſerved, by a very learned *Biſhop* of our *Church*, that ſuch kind of diſtinctions ſo applied are like the diſpute among ſome of the *Church* of *Rome* in *Scotland*, whether the *Lords Prayer* might be uſed to *Saints* or no, and it was well reſolved and very ſubtilly, that *ultimately*, *principally*, *primarily* and *ſtrictly* they might not, but *ſecondarily*, *leſs principaly*, and *largely* or *relatively* they might. The ſame would certainly hold for Images too. And I wonder very much, they ſtick at any kind of Worſhip to be done to *Images*. For my own part, were I of their mind, I ſhould as little ſcruple offering up the *Hoſt* to an *Image*, as ſaying my *Prayers* to it, and I ſhould think my ſelf hardly dealt with, if I did not come off with

B. *Andrews* Anſwer to *Perron*, p. 57

the

the same distinctions. For if I do it to *God absolutely*, and for *himself*, and to the Image only *improperly* and *relatively*, wherein am I to blame? I cannot understand, if the Image have the *honorary adoration*, as he calls it, given to it only with a respect to what is represented by it, but I may give the same kind of Worship to the Image which I do to the *Prototype*: and that, upon the rule he quotes from S. *Basil* (although *he* uses it quite upon another occasion, as if he looks upon the place he may see) *that the Worship of the Image is carried to the Prototype or thing represented.* I desire therefore seriously to know of him, whether any *Worship* doth at all belong to the *image* or no? if none at all, to what end are they *kneeled before* and *kissed*, which if the Images had any sense in them, they would think was done to them? And why doth the *Council* of *Trent* determine that *due worship* is to be given them? If there be any *due*, whether is it the *same* that is given to the *Prototype*, or *distinct* from it? if it be the *same*, then *proper Divine worship* is given to the *Image*; if *distinct*, then the *Image* is worshipped with *Divine worship* for *it self*, and not *relatively*, and *subordinately*, as he speaks.

I know, *Madam*, when any thing pincheth them, they cry presently these are *disputes of the Schools*, and *Niceties* too deep for you to be able to judge of; but I assure you some of the best learned among them, have determined which side soever you take you fall into *Idolatry*; and I hope that is no *Scholastick nicety* with you. I shall endeavour to give you their

sense as plainly as I can. *Bellarmin* saith,

Bellarm. de imag. l. 2. c. 24.

"That no Image is to be Worshipped properly with that Worship which the thing represented is worshipped by; for *Latria* (as he calls it) is a Worship proper to God; but no Image upon account of *relation*, nor any other way is *God*; therefore that *Worship* doth not belong to it. It may be, saith he, some will say, *that Latria is a Worship proper to God, when it is given for it self, and not for another* (or relatively.) I Answer, that it is of the Nature of *Latria* (or *Divine Worship*) to be given *for it self*: for, that is the worship, which is due to the true *God* as the first principle of all things, and it implies a contradiction for the highest worship to be given to the first principle, and *relatively* or for another; and therefore this worship is given to the Image for it self, which is plain *Idolatry*; or else it is not given for it self, and then it is not *Latria* or properly Divine worship. Again, either the Divine worship, or *Latria*, which is given to the Image relatively for another, is the same with that which is given to *God*, or an inferior worship; if it be the same, the Creature is equally worshipped with *God*, which certainly is *Idolatry*; For *Idolatry*, saith he, *is not only when God is forsaken, and an Idol worshipped, but when an Idol is worshipped together with God.* If it be an *inferior* worship, then it is not *Latria*, for that is the highest Worship.

Vasquez. 3. Th. disp. 108. q. 25. art. 3. c. 9.

Thus far *Bellarmin*: On the other side *Vasquez*, a *Jesuit*, a man of great reputation too, and

of

of as searching a wit as *Bellarmin*, he saith, "That if an *inferior Worship* be given to the "*Image*, *distinct* from that which is given to "the thing represented, he that so gives it in-"curs the *crime of Idolatry*; for he expresseth "his submission to a mear inanimate thing, that "hath no kind of excellency to deserve it from "him. By which we see that it is in mens choice what sort of *Idolatry* they will commit, who worship *Images*; but in neither way they can avoid it.

§. 12. But yet he thinks to escape *by some parallel instances*, as he fancies them, such as, *the honour given to the Chair of State*, *or the Kings Picture or Garment*; Moses *and* Joshua's *putting off their shooes*, *because it was holy ground*; *the Jews falling down before Gods footstool*, *and worshipping the Holie of Holies*, *where were the Cherubims*, *Propitiatory*, *and Ark*; *Protestants bowing at the name of Jesus*, *or kneeling at the Eucharist*, *and bowing before the Altar*; from these he thinks he hath sufficiently cleared, that *inferior* and *relative* worship which they give to Images. To which I answer, The instances supposed to be parallel answered.

1. *To that of the Chair of State*; that our dispute is not concerning *Civil worship*, but *Divine*; and as *to Civil Worship*, I suppose he would not say, that were any honour to the *King*, in case he had absolutely *forbidden it*, as we have proved *God* hath done in the case of *Images*.

2. *To the putting off the shooes upon holy ground*: (1.) That we think there is some little difference to be made between what *God* hath

Exod.3.5. Josh.5.15. *commanded*, and what he hath *forbidden*; for in the case of *Moses* and *Joshua*, there was an *express command*; but in the case of Image-worship there is as plain a *prohibition*. (2.) That the special presence and appearance of *God* doth *sanctifie* a place to so high a degree, that we may lawfully testifie our reverence towards it; but this will not hold for Images, unless *God* be proved present in them, in the same manner as he appeared to *Moses* and *Joshua*; and yet even then, the reverence he required was not *kissing it*, or *bowing to it*, much less *praying* to it, but only *putting off their shoes*. (3.) If these things had been done towards the *ground*, the danger had not been so great as to *Images*, because the *ground* had nothing of *Representation* in it, but was only *Sacred* by *Divine Consecration*, and therefore it could not pretend, to be any *similitude* of *God*: But in *Images* there is nothing *Sacred*, but being an *Image*; and so the *Representation* is that, which gives all the excellency and value to it; and therefore the *Reverence* of holy places and things, is of quite a different nature from the *Worship* of *Images*.

3. *To the Jews adoration towards the Ark and the Holy of Holies, where the Cherubims and Propitiatory were:* (1.) That they only directed their Worship *towards the place*, where *God* had promised to be *signally present* among them; which signifies no more to the Worship of *Images*, than our lifting *our eyes to Heaven*, doth when we pray, because *God* is more especially present there. (2.) That though the *Cherubims* were there, yet they were alwayes

wayes hid from the sight of the people, the *High-Priest* himself going into the *Holy of Holies* but once a year; that the *Cherubims* were no *representations* of *Gods* and his Throne was *between them* upon the *mercy seat*; and they were *Hieroglyphical figures* of *Gods* own appointing which the *Jews* know no more than we do: which are plain arguments they were never intended for *objects of worship*; for then, they must not have been meerly *appendices* to another thing, they must have been publickly exposed, as the *Images* are in the *Roman Churches*, and their form as well known as any of the *B. Virgin*.

4. *To bowing at the name of Jesus*; that he might as well have instanced in going to *Church* at the *toll* of a *bell*, for as the one only tells us the *time* when we ought to go to Worship *God*; so the mentioning the name of *Jesus* doth only put us in mind of him we owe all manner of reverence to, without dishonouring him as the *object* of our Worship, by any *image* of him, which can only represent that which is neither the *object* nor *reason* of our *Worship*.

5. *To kneeling at the Eucharist*, that of all things should not be objected to us, who have declared in our *Rubrick* after *Communion*, "That thereby no adoration is intended or "ought to be done either unto the Sacramental "Bread and Wine, there bodily received, or "any corporal presence of Christs natural "Flesh and Blood; for the Sacramental Bread "and Wine remain still in their very natural "substances, and therefore may not be adored;

"for

" for that were *Idolatry* to be abhorred of all
" faithful Christians.

To bowing towards the Altar, or at entring in and going out of the *Church*, that it is of the same nature with the *putting off our Hats*, while we are there; and is only determining a natural act of *Reverence*, that way which the ancient *Christians* did use to direct their *Worship*.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of their Idolatry in Adoration of the Hoſt, and Invocation of Saints.

The Argument propoſed, concerning the Adoration of the Hoſt; the inſufficiency of the Anſwer to it manifeſted: ſuppoſing equal revelation for Tranſubſtantiation as for Chriſts Divinity, yet not the ſame reaſon for Worſhipping the Hoſt as the perſon of Chriſt; the great diſparity between theſe two at large diſcovered; the Controverſie truly ſtated, concerning Adoration of the Hoſt: and it is proved, that no man, on the principles of the Roman Church, can be ſecure he doth not commit Idolatry in it. The confeſſion of our Adverſaries, that the ſame Principles will juſtifie the Worſhip of any Creature. No ſuch motives to believe Tranſubſtantiation as the Divinity of Chriſt. Biſhop Taylor's Teſtimony anſwered by himſelf. To Worſhip Chriſt in the Sun, as lawful as to Worſhip him in the Hoſt. The greateſt Idolatry excuſable, on the ſame grounds. The argument propoſed and vindicated, concerning the Invocation of Saints practiſed in the Church of Rome. *The Fathers Arguments againſt the Heathens, hold againſt Invocation of Saints; the ſtate of the Controverſie about Idolatry, as managed by them. They make it wholly unlawful, to give divine Worſhip to any Creature, how excellent ſoever. The Worſhip, not only of Heathen Gods, but of Angels*

Angels condemned. The common evaſions anſwered. Prayer more proper to God, than Sacrifice. No ſuch diſparity as is pretended, between the manner of Invocating Saints, and the Heathens Invocating their Deities. In the Church of Rome, *they do more than pray to Saints to pray for them, proved from the preſent moſt Authentick Breviaries. Suppoſing that were all, it would not excuſe them. St.* Auſtin *no friend to Invocation of Saints. Practices condemned by the Church pleaded for it. Of Negative points being Articles of faith.*

Of the Adoration of the Hoſt.

§. 1. I Proceeded *to the Adoration of the Hoſt*; and here the Argument I propoſed, was, to take off the common anſwer; *That this could not be Idolatry, becauſe they believed the Bread to be God*, upon the *ſame ground*, I ſaid, *they who believe the Sun to be God, and Worſhip him on that account, would be excuſed from Idolatry too; nay the groſſer their Idolatry was, the more excuſable it would be; as that of thoſe who ſuppoſe their Images to be Gods, and upon this ground their Worſhip was more Lawful than of thoſe who ſuppoſed them not to be ſo.* To this he anſwers two wayes; 1. *That they do not barely ſuppoſe, that the ſubſtance of bread is changed into Chriſts body, and that he is really preſent under the form of Bread; but that they know and believe this, upon the ſame grounds and motives upon which they believe that Chriſt is God; and conſequently to be adored; and further addes, that the ſame argument will hold againſt the adoration of Chriſt as God, as againſt the adoration of him in*

the

the Eucharist, since they have a like Divine Revelation for his real presence under the Sacramental signes, as for his being true God and man. 2. *Supposing they were mistaken, yet it would not follow they were Idolaters, which he proves from* Dr. Taylors *words.* But notwithstanding these appearances of answering, that my argument still stands good, will be evident by proving these things. 1. That supposing there were the same revelation of *Christs Divinity*, and of his *presence* in the *Eucharist* by *Transubstantiation*, yet there could not be the same reason for the *Adoration* of the *Host*, as for *worshipping Christ* himself. 2. That there are not the same motives and grounds to believe that Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, that there are to believe that *Christ* is *God*. 3. That supposing they are mistaken in the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, this doth not excuse them from *Idolatry*. 4. That the same reason which would excuse them, would excuse the most gross *Idolaters* in the World.

§. 2. That supposing there were the same divine revelation of *Transubstantiation* & of *Christs Divinity*, yet there could not be the same *reason* for *adoration* of the *Host* as of *Christ* himself. 1. Because there is a plain *command* in *Scripture* for one, and there is *nothing* like it for the other. *All the Angels are commanded to Worship the Son of God*; and much more *all men*, who have greater obligation to do it. *All men are to honour the Son as they honour the Father*; and *to his name every knee is to bow*: But where is there the least intimation given that we are

Heb. 1. 6.

Joh. 5. 23.

Phil. 2. 10.

to

to Worship *Christ* in the *Elements*, supposing him *present* there? If it be said, *the general command doth extend to him, where-ever he is present*; It is easily answered, that this argument doth prove no more his *Worship* in the *Elements*, than in a *turfe*, or any other *piece* of *bread*; for *Christ* being *God* is every where present; and if his *presence* only may be ground of giving *adoration* to that wherein he is *present*, we may as lawfully Worship the *Sun*, or the *Earth* or any other thing, as they do the *Sacrament*. For he is *present* in all of them. But our *Worship* is not to be guided by our own Fancies, but the will of *God*; and we have a *command* for Worshipping of the *person* of *Christ*, and till we see one as to his presence in the *Sacrament*, we ought not to think the one *parallel* with the other. And by this the weakness of his retorting the argument *in the Arrians behalf* (so he calls *those who believe Christ to be a pure man*) *against those who Worship the Son of God will appear*; for our Worship doth not meerly depend upon our *belief*, but upon the *divine command*; and therefore those who have denyed the one, have yet contended for the other. 2. The one gives us a sufficient *reason* for our *Worship*, but the other doth not: There can be no greater reason for giving his person *adoration*, than that he is the *eternal Son of God*; but what equivalent reason to this is there, supposing the *bread* to be really converted into the *body* of *Christ*; All that I can believe then present is *the body of Christ*; and what then? is that the *object* of our *adoration*? do we terminate our

Worship

Worſhip upon his humane nature? and was it ever more properly ſo than in *dying?* is it not the death of *Chriſt* that is ſet forth in the *Euchariſt?* And is his body preſent any other way, than as it is agreeable to the end of the *inſtitution?* But it may be they will ſay *the body of Chriſt being hypoſtatically united with the divine nature, one cannot be preſent without the other.* That indeed is a good argument to prove the body of *Chriſt* cannot be there by *tranſubſtantiation:* for if the bread be converted into that *body* of *Chriſt* which is *hypoſtatically* united with the *divine nature*, then the converſion is not meerly into the *body*, but into the *Perſon* of *Chriſt*; and then *Chriſt* hath as many bodies *hypoſtatically* united to him, as there are *Elements* Conſecrated; and ſo all the accidents of the *bread* belong to that *body* of *Chriſt*, which is *hypoſtatically* united with the divine nature. Nay to make the Elements the object of *divine worſhip*, as they do, they muſt ſuppoſe an *hypoſtatical union* between *them* and the *divine nature* of Chriſt; for if the only reaſon of joyning the *humane nature* with the *divine* in the *perſon of Chriſt*, as the *object* of our *Worſhip*, be the *hypoſtatical union* of theſe Natures; then we can upon no other account make thoſe Elements the *object of Worſhip*, but by ſuppoſing ſuch an *union* between *Chriſt* and *them.* But I ſuppoſe they will not venture to ſay, that *Chriſt* is *hypoſtatically* united with the *ſhape, figure* and *colour* of the *bread:* for they will have nothing elſe to remain after Conſecration (in ſpight of all the reaſon and

ſenſe

sense of the world) but meerly those *accidents*; and the *Council* of *Trent* determines *That the same Divine Worship which we give to God himself, is in express terms to be given to the most holy Sacrament, and pronounces an Anathema against all who deny it.* And what is the holy *Sacrament* but the *body of Christ*, according to them under the *accidents* of the *bread*; and although the *body* of *Christ* being believed to be there is the *reason* of their *Worship*, yet the Worship is given to the *Elements* upon that account.

Concil. Trident. Sess. 13. c. 5.

The State of the Controversie.

§. 3. But this being a matter of so great importance, to make it as clear as the nature of the thing will allow, I shall yet further prove, that, upon the *principles* of the *Roman Church*, no man can be assured that he doth not commit *Idolatry* every time he gives *adoration* to the *Host*: and I hope this will abundantly add to the discovering the *disparity* between the Worship given to the *person* of *Christ*, and that which is given to the *Eucharist* upon *supposition* of *Transubstantiation*. But before I come to this, I shall endeavour to give a true account of the *State* of the *Controversie* between us: which I shall do in these particulars.

1. The *Question* between us is not, whether the *person* of *Christ*,, is to be Worshipped *with divine worship*; for that we freely acknowledge. And although the humane nature of *Christ*, *of it self*, can yield us no sufficient reason for *adoration*, yet being considered as united to the divine nature, that cannot hinder the same divine Worship being given to his person, which

which belongs to his divine nature; any more than the *Robes* of a *Prince*, can take off from the honour due unto him.

2. It is not, whether the *person* of *Christ*, *visibly appearing* to us in any place, ought to have *divine honour* given to him? For supposing sufficient evidence of such an *appearance*, we make no more question of this, than we do of the former. Neither do we say, that we need a particular *command* in such a case to make it lawful; any more than the *Patriarchs* did at every appearance of *God* among them; or those who conversed with our *Lord* on earth, every time they fell down and Worshipped him. Where our sense and reason is satisfied as well as St. *Thomas*'s was in a *visible appearance* of *Christ*, we can give *divine Worship* as he did, when he said *My Lord and my God*; for in this Worship given to the *Person* of *Christ*, I am sure I give it to nothing, but what is either *God* or *hypostatically united* to the divine nature: *But is there not the same reason of believing Christ to be present, as of seeing him?* I answer, in matters of pure revelation there is, where the matter proposed to our faith can be no object of sense; as *Christs* infinite presence in all places as *God*, I firmly believe upon the credit of divine revelation, and I give divine Worship to him as *God*, suitable to that *infinite presence*; but our question is, concerning the *visible presence* of *Christ*, where honour is given on the account of the divine nature, but he can be *known to be present* only by his *humanity*; in this case I say, the evidence of *sense* is necessary in order to the true Worshipping

the *person* of *Christ*. If any should be so impertinent as to urge that saying to this purpose,

Joh. 20. 29. *blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed*, I shall only say, that doth not at all relate to this matter, but to the truth of Christs resurrection.

3. It is not, concerning the *spiritual Worship* of *Christ*, in the Celebration of the *Eucharist*: For we declare that in all solemn acts of *Religious Worship*, and particularly in the *Eucharist*, we give divine honour to the *Son* of *God*, as well as to the *Father*. We affirm, that we ought not only perform the offices of *Religion* out of obedience to his divine commands, but with a due Veneration of his *Majesty* and power, with thankfulness for his infinite goodness, and with trust in his promises, and subjection of our souls to his supreme *Authority*. About these things, which are the main parts of divine and spiritual Worship, we have no quarrel; nor do we find fault with any for giving too much to *Christ* in this manner; but rather for placing too much in the bare external acts of *adoration*, which may be performed with all external pomp and shew, where there is no inward reverence nor sincere devotion. And yet,

4. It is not, concerning *external Reverence* to be shewn in the *time* of receiving the *Eucharist*: For that our *Church* not only allowes, but enjoynes; and that *not barely for the avoiding such profanation and disorder in the holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue, but for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgement of the benefit of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers.*

Rubrick after Communion.

But

But it is withall declared, *that thereby no Adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christs natural flesh and blood*; as I have already recited it. But the Controversie, concerning the adoration of the *Host*, lyes in these two things. 1. Whether proper *divine Worship*, in the *time* of receiving the *Eucharist*, may be given to the *Elements*, on the account of a *corporal presence* of *Christ* under them? 2. Whether out of the time of receiving, the same *adoration* ought to be given to it, when it is *elevated* or *carried* in *procession*, which we would give to the very *person* of *Christ*? And that this is the true state of the Controversie, I appeal to the doctrine and practice of the *Roman Church* in this point. For it is expressly determined by the *Council* of *Trent*, *That there is no manner of doubt left, but that all Christians ought to give the same Worship to this holy Sacrament which they give to God himself. For it is not therefore less to be Worshipped, because it was instituted by Christ our Lord that it might be taken.* By which words the true state of the Controversie is made evident, which is not about the *reverence* due only to *Christ*, supposed to be *corporally present* there, but the *adoration* due to the *Sacrament* upon that account. And by the *Sacrament* the *Council* must understand the *elements* or *accidents* (or whatever name they call them by) as the immediate *term* of that *divine Worship*, or else the latter words signifie nothing at all. For what was that, *which was instituted by our*

Concil. Trident. Sess. 13. *c.* 5.

Lord as a Sacrament? was it not the external and viſible ſignes or elements? why do they urge, *that the Sacrament ought not the leſs to be adored becauſe it was to be taken*, but to take off the common objection that we ought not to give divine Worſhip to that which we eat? And what can this have reſpect to but the *Elements?* But this is not denyed, that I know of, by any who underſtand either the doctrine or practice of that *Church*; although to anſwer our Arguments they would ſeem to direct their *Worſhip* only to *Chriſt*, as preſent under the *elements*; yet yielding that on the account of this *corporal preſence*, that which *appears*, ought to have the ſame *Worſhip* given to it, with that which is ſuppoſed or believed. And ſo they make the *accidents* of the *Sacrament* to have the very ſame honour, which the *humane nature* of *Chriſt* hath; which they ſay hath no *divine honour* for *it ſelf*, but on the account of the *conjunction* of the *divinity* with it.

No ſecurity in the Roman Church againſt Idolatry in Adoration of the Hoſt.

§. 4. The Controverſie being thus ſtated, I come to ſhew, that upon the Principles of the *Roman Church*, no man can be aſſured that he doth not commit *Idolatry*, every time he gives *Adoration* to the *Hoſt*. For it is a principle indiſputable among them, that to give proper divine honour, called by them *Adoration*, to a creature, is *Idolatry*; but no man, upon the principles of their *Church*, can be aſſured every time he Worſhips the *Hoſt*, that he doth not give proper divine honour to a creature. For there are two things abſolutely neceſſary, to ſecure a mans mind in the performance

of

of an act of divine Worſhip. 1. That either the *object* be ſuch in it ſelf, which deſerves and requires ſuch Worſhip from us as is the *divine nature of Chriſt*: Or, 2. That if of *it ſelf*, it doth not deſerve it, there be a *reaſon* ſufficient to give it; as in the *humane nature of Chriſt* upon its *union* with the *Divine*: but in this matter, of the *adoration* of the *Hoſt*, no man can be ſecure of either of theſe, upon their own Principles.

1. He cannot be ſecure that the *object* is ſuch, as doth deſerve *divine worſhip*. If a man ſhould chance to believe his ſenſes, or hearken to his reaſon, or at leaſt think the matter diſputable, whether that which he ſees to be *bread*, be not really *bread*, what caſe is this man in? He becomes an *Idolater* by not being a *fool* or a *mad man*. But becauſe we are not now to proceed upon the principles of *ſenſe* or *reaſon*, but thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome*; I will ſuppoſe the caſe of one that goes firmly upon the received principles of it, and try whether ſuch a one can be ſatisfied in his mind, that when he gives *divine worſhip* to the *Hoſt*, he doth not give it to a *creature*. And becauſe we are now ſuppoſing unreaſonable things, I will ſuppoſe my ſelf to be that perſon. The *Maſs-bell* now rings, and I muſt give the ſame *divine honour* to the *Hoſt*, which I do to *Chriſt* himſelf: but hold, if it ſhould be but a *meer creature*, all the world cannot excuſe me from *Idolatry*, and my own *Church* condemns me, all agreeing that this is groſs *Idolatry*; how come I then to be aſſured, that what but a

little before was a meer creature, is upon the pronouncing a few words turned into my Creator. A ſtrange and ſudden change! And I can hardly ſay, that *God* becoming *man* was ſo great a wonder, as a little piece of *bread* becoming *God*. When *God* became man, he ſhewed himſelf to be *God*, by Wonders and Miracles which he wrought for the conviction of the world: I will ſee, if I can find any ſuch evidence of ſo wonderful a *transformation* from a Wafer to a *Deity*. I ſee it to be the very *ſame* it was, I handle it as I did, if I taſte it, it hath the very ſame agreeableneſs to the *Palat* it had: Where then lyes this mighty *change?* But O *carnal reaſon*, what have I to do with thee in theſe *myſteries* of *faith!* I remember what *Church* I am of, and how much I am bid to beware of *thee:* but how then ſhall I be ſatisfied? Muſt I rely on the bare words of *Chriſt*, *This is my body?* But I have been told, the *Scripture* is very obſcure and dangerous for me to be too confident of the *ſenſe* of it. I have heard ſome wiſe men of our *Church* have ſaid, that theſe words may bear a *figurative ſenſe*, like *that rock was Chriſt*, and that if there were no other evidence for *tranſubſtantiation*, but what the *Scripture* gives, there were no reaſon to make it an Article of faith. I have heard the great names of *Scotus*, *Aliaco*, *Biel*, *Fiſher*, *Cajetan*, *Canus* and others quoted to this purpoſe, and their teſtimonies produced. What a caſe am I in then, if thoſe *words* do not prove it? Now I think better of it, I muſt truſt the *Church* for the ſenſe of *Scripture*; and

if

if I be not ſtrangely miſtaken, I am ſworn to interpret *Scripture* according to the *unanimous conſent of the Fathers:* but alas, what relief is this to my anxious mind? This is a thing I am to do, or not to do, almoſt every day, and to be reſolved of it, I am put to a taſk which will hold me all my life time: and may be as unſatisfied at laſt as I am now. For I ſee the world is full of Diſputes, concerning the ſenſe of their words, as well as the *Scriptures*: One ſaith, that a Father by a *figure* means a *ſubſtance*, and that another by a *ſubſtance* means a *figure*; one man ſayes his adverſaries authorities are *counterfeit*, and another ſayes the ſame of his: one quotes the ſaying of an *Heretick* for the *Orthodox*; and another makes it appear, that if he ſpake his own mind, he muſt contradict himſelf and others of the *Fathers*. One produces a *Pope* confirming the Doctrine of *tranſubſtantiation*, and another as plain a teſtimony of another *Pope*, of greater antiquity and more learning, overthrowing it. One appeals to the firſt Ages of the *Church*, another to the *lateſt*: one ſaith, the *Fathers* ſpake *Rhetorically*, and another, *Dogmatically*. One, that they loved to talk *myſtically*, and another, that they ſpake *differently* about this matter. In this great confuſion what ground of certainty have I to ſtand upon, whereby to ſecure my mind from commiſſion of a great ſin? I am ſure if I live in wilful ſin all my dayes, I ſhall be damned; but *God* hath never told me, if I do not ſtudy the *Fathers* all my life, I ſhall be damned. It is *ſatisfaction* I deſire, and that I am not like

to have this way, when I see men of greater Wit, and Subtlety, and Judgement, than ever I am like to come to, are still disputing about the sense of the Fathers in this point: Witness the late heats in *France* about it. While I am in this *Labyrinth* a kind *Priest* offers to give me ease, and tells me, these are doubts and scruples I ought not to trouble my self about, the authority of the present *Church* is sufficient for me; I thank him for his kindness, only desiring to know, what he means by the authority of the *present Church*: For I find we *Catholicks* are not agreed about that neither. May I be sure, if the *Pope* who is *Head of the Church* say it? No, not unless he *defines* it: but may I be sure then? No, not unless a *General Council* concur: but may I be sure, if a *General Council* determines it? Yea, if it be confirmed *wholly* by the *Pope*, and doth proceed *in the way of a Council*: but how is it possible for me to judge of that, when the intrigues of actions are so secret? I see then, if this be the only way of satisfaction, I must forbear giving adoration, or be guilty of *Idolatry* in doing it. But suppose I am satisfied in the point of *transubstantiation*, it is not enough for me to know in general, that there is such a *change*; but I must believe particularly that very *bread* to be *changed* so, which I am now to worship, and by what means can I be sure of that? For my *Church* tells me, that it is necessary that he be a *Priest* that consecrates, and that he had an *intention* of consecrating that very *bread* which I am to adore. But what if it should come to pass

after

after many consecrations, that such a person prove no *Priest*, because not rightly *baptized*; (which is no unheard of thing) what became of all their actions who worshipped every *Host* he pretended to consecrate? They must be guilty of *Idolatry*, every *Mass* he celebrated. But how is it possible for me to be sure of his *Priesthood*, unless I could be sure of the *intention* of the *Bishop* that *ordained* him, and the *Priest* that *baptized* him? which it is impossible for me to be. Yet suppose I were sure he was a *Priest*, what assurance have I, that he had an intention to consecrate that very *Wafer* which I am to adore? If there were thirteen, and he had an intention to consecrate only twelve, if I worship the thirteenth, I give *divine honor* to a *meer creature*; for without the *intention* of the *Priest* in consecration, it can be nothing else; and then I am guilty of downright *Idolatry*. So that upon the principles of the *Roman Church*, no man can be satisfied, that he doth not worship a meer Creature with divine honor, when he gives *adoration* to the *Host*.

2. No man can be satisfied that he hath *sufficient reason* for giving this *worship* to the *Host*. For which we must consider, what *suppositions* the *adoration* of the *Host* depends upon, if any of which prove uncertain, I am in as bad a case as I was before. I first suppose, that the bread being really and substantially changed into that very *body of Christ* which was crucified at *Hierusalem*, I ought to give the same *honor* to that *body* of

of Chriſt in the *Sacrament*, which I am to give to the *perſon* of *Chriſt* as *God and man*; and that the *body of Chriſt* being *preſent* in the *Sacrament*, I may on the account of that *preſence* give the ſame *honour* to the *Sacrament*, in which he is preſent. But if it prove uncertain, whether the *humane nature* of *Chriſt* as conjoyned to the *divine nature* be capable of receiving proper divine worſhip, then it muſt be much more ſo, whether the body of *Chriſt* as preſent in the *Sacrament* be ſo? But granting that, it may be yet uncertain, whether I ought to give the ſame *honor* to the *viſible* part of the *Sacrament*, which I do to the *humanity* of *Chriſt*; for though *Chriſt* may be *preſent* there, his *preſence* doth not make the things wherein he is preſent, capable of the ſame divine honor with himſelf. Now that theſe things are uncertain upon their own principles, I now make appear. I find it generally agreed by the *Doctors* of the *Roman Church*, that the *humane nature* of *Chriſt*, conſidered alone, ought not to have *divine honor* given to it; and I find it hotly diſputed among them, whether *Chriſts humane nature* though *united* to the *divine*, ought, abſtractly conſidered, to have any true *divine honor* given it; and thoſe who deny it, make uſe of this ſubſtantial Argument, *proper divine honor is due only to God, but the humane nature of Chriſt is not God, and therefore that honour ought not to be given it*: And I am further told by them, that the *Church* hath never determined this Controverſie. Let me now apply this to our preſent caſe: It is *certain* if

the

the *body* of *Christ* be *present* in the *Eucharist*, as *distinct* from the *divine nature* I am not to adore it: It is very *uncertain*, if it be present, whether I am to give *divine worship* to the *body of Christ*; but it is most certain, that if I worship *Christ* in the *Sacrament*, it is upon the account of his *corporal presence*. For although when I worship the *person* of *Christ* as out of the *Sacrament*, my worship is terminated upon him as *God* and *man*, and the *reason* of my *worship* is wholly drawn from his *divine nature*; yet when I worship *Christ* as in the *Sacrament*, I must worship him there upon the account of his *bodily presence*, for I have no other reason to worship him in the *Sacrament*, but because his *body* is present in it. And this is not barely determining the *place* of *Worship*, but assigning the *cause* of it; for the primary reason of all *adoration* in the *Sacrament* is, because *Christ* hath said, *This is my body*, which words, if they should be allowed to imply *Transubstantiation*, cannot be understood of any other *change* than of the *bread* into the *body* of *Christ*. And if such a sense were to be put upon it, why may not I imagine much more agreeably to the nature of the institution, that the meer *humane nature* of *Christ* is there, than that his *Divinity* should be there in a particular manner present to no end; and where it makes not the least manifestation of it self.

But if I should yield all that can be begged in this kind, *viz.* that the *body* of *Christ* being present, his *Divinity* is there *present* too; yet my mind must unavoidably rest unsatisfied still,

as

as to the *adoration* of the *Hoſt*. For the ſuppoſing the *divine nature* preſent in any thing gives no ground upon that account, to give the ſame *Worſhip* to the thing wherein he is preſent, as I do to *Chriſt* himſelf. This the more conſiderative men of the *Roman Church* are aware of, but the different wayes they have taken to anſwer it, rather encreaſe mens doubts than ſatisfie them. *Greg. de Valentia* denies not, that "*divine honor* is given by them to the *Euchariſt*. "and that the *accidents* remaining after Con-"ſecration are the *term* of *adoration*, not for "themſelves, but by reaſon of the *admirable* "*conjunction* which they have with *Chriſt*. Which is the very ſame which they ſay of the *humane nature of Chriſt*, and yet this ſame perſon denies, that they are *hypoſtatically united* to him: which if any one can underſtand, I ſhall not envy him. *Bellarmin* in anſwer to this Argument, is forced to grant as great an *hypoſtatical union* between *Chriſt* and the *Sacrament*, as between the *divine* and *humane nature*; for when he ſpeaks of that, he ſaith it lies in this, that *the humane nature loſeth its own proper ſubſiſtence, and is aſſumed into the ſubſiſtence of the divine nature*; and in the caſe of the *Sacrament*, he yields ſuch a loſing the proper *ſubſiſtence* of the *bread*, and that what ever *remains* makes no *diſtinct ſuppoſition* from the *body* of *Chriſt*, but all belong to him and make *one* with him, and therefore may be worſhipped as he is. Is not this an admirable way of caſing the minds of diſſatisfied perſons about giving *adoration* to the *Hoſt*, to fill them with ſuch unintelligible

Greg. de Val. de Idol. l. 2. c. 5.

Bell. de Sacr. Euchar. l. 4. c. 30.

De Incarnat. l. 3. c. 8.

terms

terms and notions; which it is impossible for them to understand themselves, or explain to others? *Vasquez* therefore finding well that the force of the Argument lay in the *presence* of *Christ*, and that from thence they must at last derive only, the *ground* of *adoration*; very ingenuously yields the Consequence, and grants that *God* may very lawfully be *adored* by us in any *created Being*, wherein he is intimately present: and this he not only grants, but contends for in a set *disputation*, wherein he proves very well from the *principles* of *Worship* allowed in the *Roman Church*, that *God* may be adored in *inanimate and irrational Beings* as well as in *Images*; and answers all the Arguments the very same way that they defend the other, and that we may worship the *Sun* as lawfully, and with the same kind of Worship that they do an *Image*, and that men may be worshipped with the same Worship with which we Worship *God* himself, if our mind do not rest in the Creature, but be terminated upon *God*, as in the *adoration* of the *Host*. See here the admirable effects of the doctrine of *divine worship* allowed and required in the *Roman Church*! For, upon the very same principles that a *Papist* Worships *Images*, *Saints*, and the *Host*, he may as lawfully Worship the *Earth*, the *Stars*, or *Men*; and be no more guilty of *Idolatry* in one, than in the other of them. So that it we have no more reason to Worship the *person* of *Christ*, than they have to *adore* the *Host*; upon their principles we have no more ground to worship *Christ*, than we have to worship any *creature* in the world.

Vasquez. *Tom.* 1. *disp.* 108. *c.* 12. *n.* 111.

Disp. 110. *c.* 2, 3.

§. 5.

No such motives to believe Transubstantiation as the Divinity of Christ.

§. 5. 2. There are not the same motives and grounds to believe the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, that there are to believe that *Christ* is *God*, which he affirms, but without any appearance of reason. And I would gladly know, what excellent motives and reasons those are, which so advantageously recommend so absurd a doctrine as Transubstantiation is, as to make any man think he hath reason to believe it? I am sure it gives the greatest advantage to the enemies of *Christs divinity*, to see these two put together upon equal terms: as though no man could have reason to believe *Christ* to be the *Eternal Son* of *God*, that did not at the same time swallow the greatest contradictions to sense and reason imaginable. But what doth he mean *by these motives and grounds to believe?* The authority of the *Roman Church?* I utterly deny that to be any ground of believing at all, and desire with all my heart to see it proved: but this is a proper means to believe Transubstantiation by, for the ground of believing is as absurd as the doctrine to be believed by it. If he means *Catholick Tradition*, let him prove if he can, that Transubstantiation was a Doctrine received in the *universal Church* from our *Saviours* time; and when he pleases I shall joyn issue with him upon that subject. And if he thinks fit to put the negative upon me, I will undertake to instance in an Age since the three first Centuries, wherein if the most Learned Fathers and *Bishops* (yea of *Rome* it self) be to be credited, Transubstantiation was not believed. But if at last he means

means *Scripture* (which we acknowledge for our only rule of faith, and shall do in spight of all pretences to *Infallibility* either in *Church* or *Tradition*) I shall appeal even to *Bellarmin* himself in this case, whether there are the same motives and grounds from thence to believe *Transubstantiation*, as there are, the *Divinity of Christ*. In the proof of *Transubstantiation*, his only Argument is from those words, *this is my body*, *Which words*, saith he, *do necessarily infer either a real mutation of the Bread as the Catholicks hold, or a metaphorical as the Calvinist, but by no means do admit the Lutherans sense*; and so spends the rest of the Chapter against them: and concludes it thus, *Although there be some obscurity or ambiguity in the words of our Lord, yet that is taken away by Councils and Fathers*, and so passes to them. Which are a plain indication, he thought the same which others of his *Religion* have said, *That the doctrine of Transubstantiation could not be proved from Scripture alone*. But when he proves the *Divinity* of *Christ*, he goes through nine several *classes* of Arguments, six of which are wholly out of *Scripture*; the first out of both *Testaments*, the second only out of the *Old*, the third out of the *New*, the fourth from the names of the true *God* given to Christ, the fifth from the Divine Attributes, Eternity, Immensity, Power, Wisdom, Goodness, Majestie; the sixth from the proper *works* of *God*, Creation, Conservation, Salvation, Foreknowing of secret things, and working Miracles. All which he largely insists upon, with great

Bellar. de Sacr. Eu. l. 3. c. 19.

De Christo l. 1. c. 4.

great strength and clearness; so that if he may be judge, the motives to believe the *Divinity* of *Christ*, are far from being the same in *Scripture* that there are to believe *Transubstantiation*.

A mistake doth not excuse from Idolatry.

§. 6. 3. But supposing they are mistaken in the belief of this doctrine, this doth not excuse them from *Idolatry*. To his quotation out of Dr. *Taylors Liberty of prophecying* to the contrary, I shall return him the opinion of their own *Divines*. The Testimony of *Coster* is sufficiently known to this purpose, who saith the same thing in effect that I had done, *If the doctrine of Transubstantiation be not true, the Idolatry of the Heathens in worshipping some Golden or Silver Statue, or any Images of their Gods, or the* Laplanders *Worshipping a red cloth, or the Egyptians an animal, is more excusable, than of Christians that Worship a bit of bread.* And our Countryman *Bishop* Fisher confesseth, *That if there be nothing but bread in the Eucharist, they are all Idolaters.* But none is so fit to answer Dr. *Taylor* as himself, after almost twenty years time to consider more throughly of those things, and then he confesseth, *That the Weapons he useth for their defence were but wooden daggers, though the best he could meet with; and if that be the best they have to say for themselves which he hath produced for them, their probabilities will be soon out-ballanced by one Scripture-testimony urg'd by Protestants; and thou shalt not worship any graven Images, will outweigh all the best and fairest imaginations of their Church:* and elsewhere, *That the second Commandment is so plain, so easie, so peremptory against all*

Coster Enchir. Contr. c. 8. de Euch. Sacram. p. 308.

Fisher c. Oecolampad. l. 1. c. 2. p. (ep.) 760.

B. Taylors second part of dissuasive Introduct. in Answ. to *I S.* 5. way.

all the making and Worshipping any Image or likeneſs of any thing, that beſides that every man naturally would underſtand all ſuch to be forbidden, it is ſo expreſſed, that upon ſuppoſition that God intend to forbid it wholly, it could not more plainly have been expreſſed. By which it is clear he did not think that *Idolatry did lie only in forſaking the true God, and giving divine Worſhip to a Creature or an Idol, that is to an imaginary God, who hath no foundation in eſſence or exiſtence*; which is the reaſon he brings why they are excuſed from *Idolatry* in Adoration of the Hoſt, becauſe the object of their adoration is the *true God*; for he not only makes the ſecond Command to be peremptory and poſitive againſt the Worſhip of the true God, by an Image; but elſwhere plainly determines this to be *Idolatry*, and ſaith, *that an Image then becomes an Idol, when divine Worſhip is given to it; and that, to Worſhip falſe Gods, or to give divine honor to an Image which is not God, is all one kind of formal Idolatry.* If therefore they cannot be excuſed from *Idolatry*, who worſhip the *true God* by an *Image*, though the object of their adoration be right, and they think the manner of it to be lawful; neither can they who worſhip *Chriſt*, upon the account of *Tranſubſtantiation* in the *Sacrament*; for not only the ſuperſtition of an undue object, but of a prohibited manner or way of Worſhip is *Idolatry*; even according to the opinion of him whom he produces as a teſtimony of their innocency.

2. Part of diſſwaſ. *b.* 2. *ſ.* 6. *p.* 138.

Doctor dubitant. b. 2. *c.* 2. *p.* 344. *p.* 339.

The groſſeſt Idolatry excuſable on the ſame grounds.

§. 7. 4. That if a miſtake in this caſe will excuſe them, it would excuſe the groſſeſt *Idolatry* in the world. St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of ſome, *who ſaid that Chriſt was the Sun, and therefore worſhipped the Sun*; I deſire to know whether this were *Idolatry* in them or no? They had *Scripture* to plead for it as plain as, *This is my body*, for he is not only called *the Sun of Righteouſneſs*; but the Vulgar Latin (which they contend to be the only Authentick Verſion) reads that place, *Pſal.* 19. 6. *In ſole poſuit tabernaculum ſuum, He hath placed his Tabernacle in the Sun*; and that this is to be underſtood of *Chriſt*, may be proved from the *Apoſtles* applying the other words, *their line is gone out through all the earth*, to the *Apoſtles* preaching the *Goſpel*. And the *Manichees* did believe that *Chriſt* had his reſidence partly in the Sun, and partly in the Moon; and therefore they directed their prayers always to the Sun. Let us now conſider two perſons equally perſwaded, that the *Sun* is now the Tabernacle of *Chriſt*, and that he is really preſent there, and diſpenſes all the comfortable influences of heat and light to the world, he being ſo often in Scripture called the *true light*; and another, that he is really preſent by *Tranſubſtantiation* in the *Sacrament*. I would fain underſtand why the one ſhould not be as free from *Idolatry*, as the other? If it be ſaid, *that all thoſe places which ſpeak of Chriſt as the Sun, are to be underſtood Metaphorically*, that is the ſame thing we ſay to them concerning thoſe words of *Chriſt*, *This is my body*; and if notwithſtanding

Aug. præfat. in Pſal. 93. *Tom.* 8 *p.* 2. *p.* 184.

Rom. 10. 18.

Aug. c. Fauſt Manich. l. 20. *c.* 1. 68.

1 Joh. 8 9.

ing that, they are excused by believing otherwise; so must the other person unavoidably be so too. It is to no purpose to alledge *Fathers* and *Councils*, for one opinion more than for the other; for the question is not concerning the probability of one mistake more than of the other (although if they be strictly examined, the absurdities of *Transubstantiation* are much greater) but we suppose a *mistake* in both; and the question is, whether such a mistake doth excuse from *Idolatry* or no? and we are not to enquire into the reasons of the *mistake*, but the influence it hath upon our actions. And then we are yet to seek why a mistake equally involuntary as to the real object of divine adoration, may not excuse from *Idolatry*, as well as to the wrong application of Worship due to a real object of adoration? *i.e.* Whether a man giving adoration to what he believes to be *God*, which is not so in it self, be not as excusable, as believing a true object of adoration in general, but giving divine worship to that which is not it? as whether the worshipping false Gods, supposing them to be true, be not as venial a fault, as worshipping that for the true *God* which is not so? as for instance, suppose the *Egyptians* worshipping the *Sun* for *God*, and the *Israelites* the golden *Calf*, believing it was the true *God* which brought them out of the *Land* of *Egypt*? or let us take one of the *Inca's* of *Peru*, who believed by a Tradition supposed infallible among them, that the *Sun* was their *Father* and the *visible God*, by which the *Invisible* did govern the World;

Garcilasso de la vega le Commentaire Royal. liv. 2. c. 1.

and therefore they ought to give all external adoration to the Sun, and internal only to the *Inviſible Deity*; upon what account ſhall theſe be charged with Idolatry, if an involuntary miſtake, and firm belief that they worſhip the true God, doth excuſe from it? Nay the moſt ſtupid and ſenſleſs of all *Idolaters* who worſhipped the very *Images* for *Gods* (which the wiſeſt among them always diſclaimed, and pretended only ſuch a relative worſhip as he pleads for) were in truth the moſt excuſable upon this ground; for ſuppoſing that it be true which they believed, they did a very good thing, and what every perſon elſe ought to do upon the ſame belief. Which is the utmoſt can be ſaid for the *Papiſts* adoration of the *Hoſt*, ſuppoſing the doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* were as true as it is falſe and abſurd.

Of Invocation of Saints.

§. 8. 3. As *to Invocation of Saints*, I found the chief anſwer given was this, *That they did not attribute the ſame kind of excellency to Saints, which they give to God; but ſuppoſe only a middle ſort of excellency between God and us, which they make the foundation of the worſhip which is given to them.* And as to this my Argument was thus framed, If the ſuppoſition of a middle excellency between God and us, be ſufficient ground for formal Invocation, then the Heathens worſhip of their inferior *Deities* could be no *Idolatry*; for they ſtill pretended, they did not give to them the worſhip proper to the Supreme *God*; which is as much as is pretended by the devouteſt *Papiſts*, in juſtification

fication of the *Invocation of Saints*. To this he answers two ways: 1. *By shewing the disparity of the Heathens worship from theirs* in two things: 1. *In the object.* 2. *In the manner* of their *worship.* 1. *The persons whom they worship*, he saith, *are such as are endowed with supernatural gifts of grace in this life, and glory in Heaven; whose prayers by consequence are acceptable and available with God, but the Supreme Deity of the Heathens, is known to be* Jupiter, *and their inferior Deities* Venus, Mars, Bacchus, Vulcan, *and the like rabble of Devils as the Scripture calls them; and therefore there can be no consequence, that because the Heathens were Idolaters in the worship of these, though they pretended not to give them the worship proper to* Jupiter *the Supreme God, therefore the Catholicks must be guilty of Idolatry in desiring the servants of the true God to pray for them to him.* 2. *As to the manner of worship*, he saith, *If any of them did attain, as the* Platonists, *to the knowledge of the true God, yet as S.* Paul *says, they did not glorifie him as God, but changed his glory into an Image made like to corruptible man, adoring, and offering sacrifice due to God alone, to the Statues themselves, or the inferior Deities they supposed to dwell or assist in them, which S.* Austin *upon the* 90. Psalm *proves to be Devils, or evil Angels; because they required sacrifice to be offered to them, and would be worshipped as Gods. But all the means by formal Invocation*, he saith is, *desiring or praying the Saints to pray for them. And if this were Idolatry, we must not desire the prayers of a just man, even in this life; because this formal in-*

vocation will be to make him an Inferior Deity. 2. He answers, *that the same calumny was cast upon the Catholicks in S.* Austins *time, and is answered by him, and his answer will serve as well now as then, in his twentieth Book against* Faustus, Chap. 21. *who himself held formal Invocation a part of the worship due to Saints, as it is evident from the prayer he made to S.* Cyprian *after his Martyrdom,* l. 7. de Bapt. c. Donat. c. 1. *and* Calvin *confesseth* (he saith) *it was the custom at that time to say, Holy* Mary, *or Holy* Peter *pray for us.* This is his full answer: in which are two things to be examined. 1. Whether the disparity between the *Heathen Worship* and theirs be so great, as to excuse them from *Idolatry?* 2. Whether the answer given by S. *Austin* doth vindicate them: and whether *Invocation* of *Saints*, as it is now practised in the *Church* of *Rome*, were allowed, or in use then?

The Fathers arguments against Heathen Idolatry condemn Invocation of Saints.

§. 9. 1. Concerning the disparity. 1. As to the *object* of *worship*. Far be it from me to parallel the *Holy Angels* and *Saints*, with the impure *Deities* of the *Heathens* as to their excellencies: but the true state of the *Question* is, Whether the *Heathens* were only too blame in making an ill choice of those they worshipped, as in worshipping *Jupiter*, and *Venus*, and *Vulcan*, who are supposed to have been wicked wretches, or else in giving divine worship to any besides the true *God?* And if their *Idolatry* lay not only in the former, but the latter, then this disparity cannot excuse them. There were two *Questions* in debate between the

Pri-

Primitive *Fathers* of the *Christian Church*, and the *Heathen Idolaters*. The first was more general, and *in Thesi*; Whether it were lawful to give divine worship to any besides the true and Supreme God? The second was more particular, and *in Hypothesi*; Whether on supposition that were lawful, those whom the *Heathens* worshipped were fit objects for such adoration? In this latter they triumph over them with a great deal of eloquence, laying open the impiety of those whom they commonly worshipped; but withal, knowing that the wiser among them had another notion of these *Deities* under the common names than the *Vulgar* had, they therefore charge them with *Idolatry*, in giving the worship proper to *God*, to any Creature, let it be never so excellent, and serviceable to mankind: and tell us, that it was the property of the *Christian Religion to give divine worship to none, but God himself, and his Son Christ Jesus*; without ever making any distinctions of absolute and relative worship, which they must have been driven to, in case they had given *Religious worship* to any besides. Thus *Justin Martyr* tells the *Heathen Emperors*, to whom he makes his *Apology* for the *Christians*, *that Christ did perswade men to worship God alone, by saying, This is the great Commandment, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve; and that we are to render to* Cæsar *the things that are* Cæsars, *and to God the things that are Gods: on which account*, saith he, *we worship God alone, and give cheerful service in all other things to you.* *Theophilus Bishop* of *Antioch* (who lived

Justin. Martyr Apol. 2. p. 65. 66.

Theophil. ad Autolyc. l. 1. p. 77.

in the ſecond Century after Chriſt, as well as *Juſtin*) giving an account why the *Chriſtians* refuſed to give *adoration* to the *Emperors*, as was then uſed (not that adoration, which was proper to the *Supreme God*; for none can be ſo ſenſleſs to imagine, they required that: but ſuch kind of Religious worſhip, as they gave to the *Images* of their *Gods*) ſaith, *That as the King or Emperor ſuffers none under him to be called by his name; and that it is not lawful to give it to any but himſelf: ſo neither is it to worſhip any, but God alone:* and elſwhere ſaith, *that the Divine Law doth not only forbid the worſhip of* L. 2. p. 110. *Idols, but of the Elements, the Sun, and Moon, and Stars, or any thing elſe in Heaven, in Earth, in Sea, or Fountains, or Rivers; but we ought only to worſhip the true God and Maker of all things, in the holineſs of our hearts, and integrity of our minds.* To the ſame purpoſe ſpeak *Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, Athenagoras, Lactantius, Arnobius*; who all agree, that Religious worſhip is proper to the true *God*, and that no created thing is capable of it, on that very account becauſe it is created; it were eaſie to produce their teſtimonies, if it were requiſite in ſo evident a matter as this is. If it be ſaid, *That all theſe teſtimonies are only againſt that Idolatry which was then practiſed by the Heathens.* I anſwer, 1. Their reaſons equally extend to the giving Divine worſhip to to any *Created Being* whatſoever; ſo that either they argued weakly and unskilfully, or elſe it is as unlawful to give *Divine worſhip* now to *Saints*, as it was then to any *creature*.

2. I

2. I would willingly understand, why it should be more unlawful to worship *God* for his admirable Wisdom, and Power and Goodness in the works of Creation, than in supposed *Saints? i.e.* why I may not as well honour *God* by giving worship to the *Sun*, as to *Ignatius Loyola*, or St. *Francis*, or any other late *Canonized Saint?* I am sure the *Sun* is a certain monument of Gods Goodness, Wisdom, and Power, and I cannot be mistaken therein, but I can never be certain of the *Holiness* of those persons I am to give divine worship to. For all that I can know, *Ignatius Loyola* was a great hypocrite; but I am sure that the *Sun* is none; but that he shines, and communicates perpetual influences to the huge advantage of the world. However I know the best of men have their corruptions, and to what degree it is impossible for others to understand; but I am certain the spots in the Sun are no Moral impurities, nor displeasing to God. And *Philip Nerius* could not have been mistaken in the shining of the *Sun*, although he might be in the shining of *Ignatius* his face; which yet is thought so considerable a thing, that it is read in the Lessons appointed for *Ignatius* in the *Roman Briviary*. *Breviar. Rom.* 31. *Jul. Antw.* 1663.

3. On what account should the *Christians* refuse giving all external signs of Religious worship to the *Heathen Emperours*, if they thought it lawful to be given to any sort of men? Why might not they worship the *Statues* of *Kings* and *Princes*, as well as others do those of *Rebels* and *Traytors?* I mean, why might not the *Image* of *King Henry the second* have the

the same reverence shewn to it, that the *Shrine* of *Thomas Becket* had? unless it be more meritorious to disobey a *Prince*, than to give him reverence. Might not the Primitive *Christians* have much easier defended themselves, in giving those outward signs of worship to the *Images* of *Emperours*, than others can do in the worship they give to *Saints*? For they might have pleaded, that external signs are to be interpreted by the intention of the person who uses them; that they intended no more by them, but the highest degree of Civil honour on the account of the authority they possessed? or if this would not serve, might not they have said, that *Kings* and *Princes* were *Gods Vicegerents*, and represented him to the world, and that in giving divine worship to them, they gave it to *God*; and that their absolute, ultimate, and terminative worship was upon God; and only a relative, inferior, and transient worship was given to them; and all this might be better justified by St. *Basils* rule, *That the honour of the Image passes to the Prototype*; for he there pleads for the worship of *Christ*, *because he is one with the Father, being his Image*; *as the Image of a King is called the King, and hath the same honour given to it*; *for the honour of the Image passeth to the thing represented.* And as *Christ* hath the advantage above all, by being *Gods natural Image*; so *Princes* above *Saints*, in that they represent *God* to the world, which the other do not. But notwithstanding all these Pleas, the Primitive *Christians* were so punctual in observing that Command of worshipping

S. Basil. ad Amphiloch. p. 332.

shipping *God* alone, that they rather chose to lose their lives and suffer Martyrdom, than be in the least guilty of giving any divine worship to a creature.

4. They absolutely deny, that any religious worship is to be given to the most excellent created Beings; and therefore did not only condemn the Idolatry then in use, but that which hath obtained in the *Roman Church*: supposing all the persons worshipped therein to have been real *Saints*. For that, we are to consider that all the *Heathens* were not such great Fools, as some men make them, to excuse themselves: if the wiser men were contented to let the people worship the *Poetical Gods*, having their minds possessed with those *Idea*'s of them, which they had taken up by their education; yet they understood them only as *Allegories*, (as some make the Image of St. *Christopher*, and St. *George* in the *Church* of *Rome* to be no other) and they had Temples erected to the greatest Vertues, to *Piety*, *Faith*, *Concord*, *Justice*, *Chastity*, *Clemency*, &c. and others to the greatest Benefactors to mankind; which was the only ground they pleaded, for giving worship to them: but still they acknowledged one *Supream God*, not *Jupiter* of *Creet*, but *the Father of Gods and men*; only they said, *this Supream God* being of so high a nature, and there being other intermediate beings between him and men, whose Office they conceived it was to carry the prayers of men to God, and to bring down help from him to them; they thought it very fitting, to address their solemn supplications

V. Aug. c. Faust. l. 20. c. 9.

Baron. Martyrol. Apr. 23. & Julii 25.

to

to them. Here now was the very ſame caſe in debate, (altering only the names of things) which is between us, and the *Church* of *Rome*; and if ever they ſpeak home to our caſe, they muſt upon this point. And ſo they do, but very little to their comfort.

All divine worſhip given to a creature condemned by the Fathers.

§. 10. Theſe things I ſhall largely prove, if farther occaſion be given; at preſent I ſhall only inſiſt on two things. 1. That they did condemn all ſuch kind of worſhip, ſuppoſing their principle true. 2. That they did not only condemn it, in thoſe Spirits which the *Heathens* worſhipped, but in good *Angels* themſelves. 1. They did condemn the worſhip, ſuppoſing their principle true. For this I ſhall produce now but few Authorities, but ſuch as are full as to the *Heathens* pretences, and the *Chriſtians* anſwers. The firſt is of *Origen* in his anſwer to *Celſus*, who objects againſt the *Chriſtians*, the *unreaſonableneſs of forſaking the worſhip of inferiour Deities, becauſe no man can ſerve two Maſters*; *which*, ſaith he, *is a ſeditious principle, and ariſes from attributing our paſſions to God*; *but he that honours them as Subjects to the Supream God, cannot offend him who is the Lord of them.* To which *Origen* anſwers, *That the Scripture doth indeed ſtile God, the God of Gods, and Lord of Lords, but withal ſaith, that to us, there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things, and we by him*; *which the Apoſtle ſpeaks*, ſaith he, *of himſelf and all others, whoſe minds were raiſed up to him who is the God of Gods, and Lord of Lords, and his mind aſcends up to the Supream God,*

Origen. c. Cel. l. 8. p. 381.

who

who worships him inseparably and indivisibly by his Son, who alone conducts us to the Father. Therefore seeing there are many Gods and many Lords, we endeavour by all means, not only to carry our minds above those things on Earth, which are worshipped by the Heathen for Gods, but above those whom the Scripture calls Gods, by which it is plain by the drift of his discourse, he means the *Angels*. And *Celsus* afterwards yielding, *That it is not lawful* P. 384. *to give honour to any, but to whom the Supream doth communicate it: Origen* desires proof from them, *That God hath communicated this honour to their Gods, Heroes and Dæmons; and that it did not arise from the ignorance and folly of mankind, who thereby fell off from him who ought properly to be worshipped.* But he proves, *from Miracles, and Prophecies, and Precepts, that this honour was given to Christ, that they who honour the Father, should honour the Son also*: and that was all which *Celsus* had to object against the *Christians, That they did not keep to their own rule, of worshipping God alone; for they thought God was not dishonoured, by the honour they gave to Christ, and on the same account he thought, they might give it to inferiour Deities.* If there had been then any suspicion of Religious worship given to *Saints* or *Angels* by the *Christians*, when had there been a more proper season to object it? No man, of the meanest capacity, would have omitted a matter so necessary to his business; much less so inquisitive and malicious an enemy, as *Celsus* was. And the account *Origen* gives of the worship the Christians attribute to the Son of God is, *because it is said, I and my Father are one; and the Father in me, and I*

in

in him; which cannot be said of any created Beings. It is true, afterwards he saith, *That if* Celsus *had spoken of the true Ministers of God, such as* Gabriel, Michael *and all the Angels and Archangels, he acknowledges, that by explaining the notion of worship or respect, and the actions of those who give it, somewhat more might be said on that subject.* But he utterly denyes, *that our prayers are to be offered to any, but Christ alone; and that any word which is proper only to Religious worship, is to be attributed to the Angels themselves.* For he saith elsewhere, *Although the Angels be called Gods in Scripture, yet we are not to worship them with divine worship:* and lest any should think, that offering up our Prayers or Invocations to them were not excluded by this; he immediately explains himself; *For,* saith he, *all our supplications, prayers, intercessions and thanksgivings are to be offered only to God over all; by that High Priest who is greater than all the Angels, the living Word, and God.* And afterwards saith, *we ought not to pray to them, who pray for us; for they would rather themselves send us to that God to whom they pray, than have us pray to them, or divide our supplications between God and them.* This he speaks indeed of the *Sun*, and *Moon*, and *Stars*, but upon the supposition that they are *intellectual Beings*, and *do pray to God for us.* And again he saith, *We ought to pray only to the God over all, and his only Son the first born of every creature, who as our High Priest, offers our prayers to his God and our God.* And because *Celsus* argues much for worship to be given to

L. 5. p. 233.

P. 238.

L. 8 p. 395.

P. 402.

Dæmons,

Dæmons, because *to them is committed the care of terestrial affairs* : to this *Origen* answers, *by denying those whom he calls Dæmons, to have any administration of the affairs of Christians ; but supposing we knew they were not Dæmons, but Angels, which had the management of these things committed to them, yet then we dare not give them that honour which is due to God, for neither would God have it so, nor they themselves* ; but ἐυφημοῦμεν αὐτοὺς καὶ μακαρίζομεν, *we celebrate their praise and happiness, to whom God hath entrusted such great things.* But *Celsus* yet further urges, *that, according to the doctrine of the Ægyptians, every part of a man hath a particular Dæmon, or Ethereal God ; and every one of these being invocated, heals the diseases of the parts proper to themselves. Why then may they not justly invocate them, if they love health better than sickness, and happiness than misery.* If one of the *Church* of *Rome* had been to answer *Celsus*, he must have told him, that the thing was rational which he said, only they were out in their names ; for instead of *Chnumen*, *Chnaachumen*, *Cnat*, *Sicat*, *Biu*, *Eru*, *&c.* they should have chosen *Raphael* for travelling, and against Diseases, *Apollonia* against the Tooth-ach, *Sebastian* and *Roch* against the Plague, St. *Nicholas* against Tempests, *Michael* and St. *George* against Enemies ; and others in like cases. For so *Serrarius* tells us, *That experience and tradition hath discovered the particular help of these in such cases ; if they be particularly invocated.* But *Origen* gives a shorter answer, *That these things do arise from a distrust of the sufficiency of that incommunicable*

P. 416.

Serrar. Litan 2. q. 32.

worship

worſhip we give to God alone, as though he were not able to protect every one that ſerves him from all ſnares: and that far more effectual cures have been wrought by the name of Jeſus than all their Dæmons. And how much better do thoſe who are Chriſtians, who ſlight all theſe things and commit themſelves to God over all, through his ſon Jeſus Chriſt; and of him do deſire the help and protection of his Holy Angels? I ſhall conclude his Teſtimony with that excellent ſaying of his.

P. 410. *Our care ought to be to pleaſe one God over all, and to make him propitious to us, by piety and all vertue, but if we would have others under God to be pleaſed with us too, we ought to conſider, that as the ſhadow follows the body, ſo God being pleaſed, all his friends whether Angels, Souls or Spirits will be ſo too, and not only ſo, but are ready to help them, and pray to God for them.* But not the leaſt foundation in his diſcourſe for our invocation of them.

Amb. of. in 1. Rom. To. 3. p. 174

The Author of the *Commentaries* under the name of St. *Ambroſe*, of the ſame age with him (as appears by ſeveral paſſages in him) ſaith, *That the Idolaters made uſe of this miſerable excuſe for themſelves, that by thoſe inferiour Deities they worſhipped, they went to God himſelf, as we go to the King by his Courtiers. But*, ſaith he, *is any man ſo mad, or regardleſs of himſelf, to give the honour due to the King to any of his Courtiers; which if a man does, he is condemned for treaſon? And yet they think themſelves not guilty, who give the honour due to Gods name, to a creature; and forſaking God adore his fellow ſervants, as though any thing greater than that were*

were reserved for God himself. But therefore we go to a King by his Officers and Servants, because the King is but a man, who knows not of himself whom to imploy in his publick affairs, (without being recommended by others:) *But with God it is otherwise, for nothing is hid from him, he knows the deserts of every one, and therefore we need no one to recommend us to his Favour; a devout mind is enough.* Was this now all the quarrel the *Christians* had with the *Heathens*, that they worshipped *Jupiter* and *Venus* and *Vulcan?* Do they not expresly deny the giving *Gods* Worship to any Creature? and do they not as plainly affirm, that men do it when they invocate their *fellow servants* to be intercessours with God for them? and that it is no less a guilt of Idolatry in this case, than it is in giving the *Honour* due to a *Prince* to any of his Servants?

St. *Austin* gives this account of the principles of the *Heathen Worship*, *that there were three sorts of Beings to be considered, purely divine, and mortal, and a middle sort between them, which participated of both; and that the entercourse between Gods and men, was by the means of those intermediate Beings, who carried the prayers of men up to God, and brought down the blessings they prayed for to men.* Against these indeed St. *Austin* disputes first, by shewing that those *spirits* which they worshipped were *evil spirits*; and that there was no reason to imagine, that *God* had a greater entercourse with them, than with penitent sinners; but withall he addes, *that this kind of worship doth proceed upon the* *Aug. de Civit. Dei. l. 8. c. 14. 18.* c. 21.

supposition that the Gods cannot know the necessities and prayers of men, but by the intervention of those Spirits: but if our minds can be known without their help, there is no need of their mediation. L. 9. c. 15. And afterwards saith, *that those who are Christians do believe, that we need not many, but one Mediatour, and that such a one, by whose participation we are made happy, i. e. the word of God, not made, but by whom all things were made: and He hath shewed, that to the attaining blessedness we ought not to seek many Mediators, by whom we are to make our degrees of approach to God; because God himself, by partaking our Nature, hath shewn us the shortest way of our partaking his divinity. Neither doth He, delivering us from mortality and misery, carry us to immortal and blessed Angels, that by participating with them, we should become blessed and immortal; but to that Trinity, by whose participation the Angels themselves are blessed.* And concludes that *Book* with this saying, *that immortal and blessed Spirits, however they are called, which are made and created, are no Mediatours to bring miserable mortals to blessedness and immortality.* L. 9. c. 23. And it would be ridiculous here to distinguish *mediators* of *redemption* and *intercession*; for all that they attributed to their good *spirits* was only *Intercession*; and *Christ* being made a *Mediatour*, effectual for the end he designed, there could be no necessity of any *Intercessours* besides him. And St. *Austin* there addes, that the design of his following *Book* is to prove, *that those good Spirits which are immortal and blessed, which they thought ought to be Wor-*

shipped

ſhipped with Sacred Rites and Sacrifices, whatſoever they are and howſoever called, would not have any one worſhipped by ſuch religious worſhip, (i.e. by *ſacred rites* as well as *Sacrifices*) *but only one God, by whom they were created, and by whoſe participation they are made happy.*

§. 11. By which the ſecond thing I propoſed will appear to be true, *viz.* that they did not only condemn giving this Worſhip to the *Spirits* which the *Heathen* Worſhipped, but to good *Angels* too. For St. *Paul* in the general doth condemn *the Worſhip of Angels*; if he had meant only *evil Angels* he would have expreſſed it ſo; eſpecially if St. *Auſtins* obſervation be true, *that the evil Spirits are by their names in Scripture diſtinguiſhed from the good*; if he had meant any particular *ſuperſtition*, uſed in the Worſhip of *Angels*, he would not have uſed ſuch terms which condemn all *worſhip* of them as *ſuperſtitious*; if he had meant only the *Worſhip* of *Angels*, ſo as to exclude *Chriſt*, he would have intimated that the fault, lay in *excluding Chriſt*, and not in the bare *worſhip* of *Angels*; but by the ſeries of his diſcourſe it appears, that thoſe who ſet up other *Mediators* beſides *Chriſt* do not *hold the head*, *i. e.* do not adhere to *Chriſt* alone, as him whom *God* hath appointed as our *Mediatour* only. Whether this were practiſed by *Jewes*, *Philoſophers*, or *Hereticks* is all one to us; ſince the practice is condemned, wherever it is found. *Theodoret* ſaith, *they were the Jewes who perſwaded men to worſhip Angels, becauſe the Law was delivered by Angels; which practice*

The Worſhip of Angels condemned. Col. 2. 18.

Theod. in Coloſſ. 2. 18.

he ſaith, *continued a long time in* Phrygia *and* Piſidia, *and therefore the Synod of* Laodicea *doth forbid praying to Angels; and to this day, the Oratories of St.* Michael *are among them; they therefore thought it a piece of humility, ſince God could not be ſeen, nor touched, nor comprehended by us, to obtain the favour of God, by the interceſſion of Angels.* No wonder *Baronius* is ſo much diſpleaſed with *Theodoret* for this interpretation; for he very fairly tells us *what he condemns* (and St. *Paul* too) *was the practice of their Church; and thoſe Oratories were ſet up by Catholicks, and not by hereticks.* But whether as to the lawfulneſs of this Worſhip, *Baronius* or St. *Paul*, whether as to the ancient practice of the *Church*, *Baronius* or *Theodoret* deſerves more to be believed, I leave any one to judge. And yet *Theodoret* is not alone in this; for *Irenæus* denies *any invocations of Angels to be in uſe among Chriſtians*; if he had meant only *evil Angels*, it ſeems very ſtrange he ſhould uſe the name generally given to *good*, and alwayes indifferent to both. *Origen* expreſly denies *any offering up of Prayers to them, to be practiſed by Chriſtians, or reaſonable to be done; and produces this very place of the Apoſtle againſt it.* The *Council* of *Laodicea*, we ſee by *Theodoret*, is very ſevere againſt *all who Worſhip Angels*, and charges them *with Idolatry in ſo doing*; if they had only meant the *Heathen Idolaters*, as *Baronius* contends, yet by that it appears that the *Heathens* were condemned for Worſhipping thoſe, whom they believed to be *good ſpirits*; but theſe are only *ſhifts*, to eſcape by, and ſuch which

Baron. An. 60. ſ. 20, 21.

Iren. l. 2. c. 57.

Orig. c. Celſ. l. 5. p. 233. P. 236.

Concil. Laodic. Can. 35.

which would not have come into the mind of any man, if he did not first fear the force of that *Canon* against the practice of the *Roman Church*. For why the *Heathen Idolatry* should at that time be called *secret or hidden*, as it is in that *Canon*, is not easie to be thought upon; but very easily intelligible according to *Theodorets* interpretation, because of the *clandestine meetings* of those who *worshipped Angels*, and therein separated themselves from the *Christian Churches*. St. *Austin* discourses purposely on this subject (as is intimated before) whether *God* or the *Blessed Spirits* are willing *we should perform any sacred offices or Sacrifices to them*; *or consecrate our selves, or any thing of ours, to them, by any religious rites*: which he denies: *For this*, saith he, *is the worship proper to the Deity*, called by him in one word *Latria*, which he thinks more proper to express *divine worship*, as distinct from the honour and service we give to men (which is plainly his meaning there) than any one word *Greek* or *Latin* besides. And this *word* he saith *is proper to the Deity*, as such; because he elsewhere tells us, *the difference between* λατρεία *and* δουλία, *is this, that* λατρεία *is the Service of God, properly, as God*; δουλία *is the service of God, as Lord*.

Aug. de civit. Dei l. 10. c. 1.

Aug. q. in Exod. q. 94.

§. 12. I know very well by what arts all these testimonies are endeavoured to be evaded, *viz.* by saying, *That these are intended against the Gentiles Idolatry, who Worshipped those Spirits as Gods, and offered Sacrifices to them*; *but this cannot hold as to the Doctrine or practice of the Roman Church, who deny them to be Gods,*

The common evasions answered.

and aſſerts that the Worſhip by Sacrifice is proper only to God: but ſuch devices as theſe are can never ſatisfie an impartial mind. For (1.) They do expreſly deny, that *invocation* or *prayer* is to be made to them; for ſo *Origen* and *Theodoret* ſpeaks expreſly, *that men are not to pray to Angels*; and any one that reads St. *Auſtin* will find, that he makes ſolemn invocation to be as proper to *God*, as Sacrifice is. (2.) On what account ſhould it be unlawful to *Sacrifice* to *Saints* or *Angels* if it be lawful to *invocate* them? may not one be *relative* and *tranſient* as well as the other? nay the *Heathen* in St. *Auſtin* argued very well, *that Sacrifices, being meer external things, might more properly belong to the Inferiour Deities, but the more inviſible the Deity was, the more inviſible the Sacrifices were to be; and the greater and better the Deity, the Sacrifice was to be ſtill proportionable:* and can any man in his ſenſes think, that a meer outward *Sacrifice* is more acceptable to *God*, than the *devotion* of *our heart* is? and wherein can we better expreſs that to *God*, than in offering up our *prayers* to him? ſo that in all reaſon the duty of *prayer* ought to be reſerved as more proper to *God* than any external ſacrifice; and thoſe who did appropriate Sacrifice to *God*, did comprehend *prayer* as the moſt ſpiritual and acceptable part of it: So St. *Auſtin* ſpeaking of the *Sacrifice* due to *God, makes our heart the Altar, and Chriſt our Prieſt, and our Prayers and Praiſes to be offered up to God by a fervent charity; and any work, which is therefore done, that thereby we may be united to God in a holy Communion*

Aug. de Civit. D. l. 10. c. 19.

L. 10. c. 5.

munion with him, in order to our happiness, to be a true Sacrifice; and let any man judge, whether this description do not so naturally agree to *prayer*, as if it had been only intended for it. C. 6.

Besides, it is observable, that *sacrifices* of old were solemn rites of *supplication*; and *calling upon the name of the Lord* where Altars were erected, is the main thing spoken of; thence the *Temple* (though the place of sacrifice) is called *the house of Prayer*; and where *God* slights *sacrifices*, he requires *prayer* as much more acceptable to him. It seems then very strange, that *sacrifice* alone, as distinguished from *prayer*, should be that *Latria* that is proper to God. Gen. 21. 33. 26. 25. Isa. 56. 7. Psal. 50. 6. 15.

(3.) Upon the same account that the *Heathen* did give divine honour to their *inferiour Deities*, those in the *Roman Church* do so to *Angels* and *Saints*. For the *Heathens* made a difference in their *sacrifices* to the supreme *God*, and their inferiour *Deities* and their *Heroes*: so that if the putting any difference in the way of religious Worship doth excuse the one, it must do the other also. Did the *Heathen* use solemn Ceremonies of making any capable of *divine worship*? so does the *Roman Church*. Did they set up their *Images* in publick places of *worship*, and there kneel before them, and invocate those represented by them? so does the *Roman Church*. Did they consecrate Temples, and erect *Altars* to them, and keep Festivals, and burn Incense before them? so do's the *Roman Church*. Lastly, did they offer up *Sacrifices* in those Temples, to the *Honour* of their lesser *Deities* and *Heroes*? so does the *Roman Church*.

Bell. de Sanct. beat. l. 1. c. 7. For *Bellarmin*, reckoning up the honours belonging to *Canonized Saints*, besides those before mentioned reckons up this as one, *that the Sacrifices of the Eucharist, and of lauds and prayers are publickly offered to God for their honour.* I would fain understand, what the sacrificing to *one* for the *honour* of *another* means? To offer Sacrifice *to one for another*, is an intelligible thing; but to Sacrifice *to one for the honour of another* is a thing beyond my reach, if that *sacrifice* does not belong to him for whose *honour* it is offered; and if the sacrifice do belong to him, I wonder at the scrupulosity of those who dare not say they *Sacrifice* to him as well. For what is *sacrificing* to God, but sacrificing *to his honour*, or doing such an act of Religion with a design to *honour God* by it: but when men offer a Sacrifice, but not to honour *God* by it, but the *B. Virgin*, or any *Saints* or *Angels*, how can that *Sacrifice* belong to any other but those whose *honour* is designed by it? It being then the opinion and practice of the *Roman Church*, that Sacrifices are to be offered for the *honour* of *Saints* or *Angels*, it is evident they have reserved no part of divine worship peculiar to *God* himself, any more than the *Heathen* did. (4.) It makes no material difference, that the *Heathen* called those they worshipped *Gods*, but they do not so in the *Roman Church*.

Aug. de Civit. Dei l. 9. c. 23. For St. *Austin* saith, *there was scarce any difference between the Heathen and them about the name, whether Angels might be called Gods or no: for he thinks that they are called so in Scripture, as well as* Origen: but the Question

was

was about the thing, whether they were to be *Worshipped* as *Gods*, or no, *i. e.* by giving any part of *Religious worship* to them? which they utterly deny. And, were I in the Communion of the *Roman Church*, I should much less scruple to call *Canonized Saints* or *Angels*, by the names of *Gods*, than to give them the *worship* of *Invocation* or the *honor* of *Sacrifices*: And they who do so, are not only condemned by plain *Scripture*, and *Reason*, but by those of the *Primitive Church* who writ against the *Heathen Idolatry*: which was the thing to be shewed.

§. 13. 2. Another disparity is insisted on by him, which is, as to the *manner of worship*. *And as to this*, he saith, *all that they understand by formal Invocation, is desiring or praying those just persons, who are in glory in heaven to pray for us; and if the Catholicks be guilty of Idolatry in this, we must not desire the prayers of a just man even in this life, because this formal Invocation will be to make him an inferior Deity.* To shew the palpable weakness of this answer, I shall prove these two things. 1. That those in the *Church* of *Rome* do allow and practise another kind of *formal Invocation*, from what he asserts. 2. That supposing this were all, it would not excuse them; and that it is of a very different nature, from *desiring the prayers of just men for us in this life.* Of the practice of Invocation in the Church of *Rome.*

1. That they do allow and practise another kind of *formal Invocation* from what he asserts. He might very well say, he did not understand well what I meant by *formal Invocation*, when he

he makes this to be the meaning of it; for never any perſon before him imagined that ſenſe of it; And that term of *formal Invocation* was purpoſely choſen by me, to diſtinguiſh it from the *Rhetorical Apoſtrophe's* of ſome of the *Greek Fathers*, the *Poetical Flouriſhes* of *Damaſcus*, *Prudentius*, and *Paulinus*; from *general wiſhes* that the *Saints* would pray for us. Of which are ſome inſtances, in good Authors; from *aſſemblies at the Monuments of Martyrs*, which were uſual in ancient times; and that which I thought any man would underſtand by it was that which is conſtantly practiſed in the *Roman Church*, *viz.* in places and times purpoſely appointed for *Divine* and *Religious Worſhip*, with all the ſame external ſigns of *devotions* which we uſe to *God* himſelf, to offer up our *Prayers to Saints*, or *Angels*, to help us in our neceſſities, as well as to pray to *God* for us. The former part none can be ignorant of, that have but ſo much as heard of the devotion of the *Church* of *Rome*; all the difficulty lies in that, whether *they pray to them to help their neceſſities*, as well *as to pray for them?* And ſo many *forms* of Prayer, allowed and practiſed in their *Church*, have been ſo often objected to them, wherein theſe things are manifeſt, that I cannot but wonder this ſhould be denied. Do they believe, we never look into their *Breviaries*, *Roſaries*, *Hours*, and other Books of Devotion, wherein, to this day, ſuch Prayers are to be found? Do they think we never heard of the *Offices* of the *B. Virgin*, or our *Ladies Pſalter* (a Blaſphemous Book, never yet con-

censured) wherein the *Psalms*, in their highest strains of *Prayer* to *God*, are applied to the *V. Mary*? I have known my self intelligent persons of their *Church*, who commit their souls to the *V. Maries* protection every day, as we do to *Almighty God*: and such, who thought they understood the doctrine and practice of their *Church*, as well as others. But *Madam*, these are mysteries not to be known till they have their *Proselytes* safe and fast enough; then, by degrees, they let them know, what is to be done, when they have given away all liberty of judging for themselves. Then, it is no matter what they are commanded or expected to do, they must do as others do, or else their sincerity is questioned, and they are thought *Heretick*s in their hearts, whatever they profess. I shall not insist upon any ancient *Breviaries*, or obsolete *Forms*, or private *Devotions*, which yet they are accountable for, till they do condemn them. I need no more than the present *Roman Breviary* restored according to the *Council* of *Trent*, and authorized by three several *Popes*. In the *Feast* of *Assumption* of the *Blessed Virgin*, as though it were not enough in the *Antiphonæ* to say, *Hail Blessed Virgin, thou alone hast destroyed all Heresies in the world*, but lest this should be interpreted of doing it by her Son, a *formal Invocation* of her follows, *Vouchsafe to let me praise thee O Holy Virgin; and give me strength against thy enemies*. And in the *Hymn* frequently used in her *Office*, and particularly that day, she is not only called *the Gate of Heaven*, but *she is intreated to loose the bonds of the guilty, to give light to the blind*,

Brev. Rom. Antw. 1663. *p.* 984.

blind, and to drive away our evils, and to shew her self to be a Mother; or as it is in the *Mass-book* printed at *Paris*, 1634. *Jure Matris impera redemptori*, *by the Authority of a Mother, command the Redeemer.* This is not to pray to her, to pray to God for us; but to pray her to order and command him what he shall do for us: And is not this a notable respect to *Jesus Christ* now he is in glory, and hath all power in heaven and in earth committed to him; to subject him to the commands of a woman, though honored to be his Mother. In a word, *They pray to her therein for purity of life, and a safe conduct to heaven.* But lest the Hymns should be thought only *Poetical*, in the
P. 911. *Feast of S. Maria ad Nives*, *Aug.* 5. a formal prayer is made to her, *to help the miserable, to strengthen the weak, to comfort those that mourn, and that all who celebrate her holy Festivity may feel her assistance.* By which we may understand the meaning of that solemn *Hymn* used in her Office, wherein she is called *the Mother of*
Offic. parv. B. Mariæ, p. 127. *Mercy and Clemency, and is prayed to protect us from our enemies, and to receive us in the hour of death.* Is all this only praying to her to pray for us? What could be more said to *Almighty God*, or his Son *Jesus Christ?* Either there can be no such thing as direct and immediate prayers to any one, or these are such. Nor is this devotion only to the *Blessed Virgin*, but we shall see it alike in that to *Angels* and *Saints*;
Brev. p. 124. in the *Antiphona* upon the apparition of *Michael* the *Archangel* May 8. *he is prayed to come to the help of the people of God.* And in the

Feast

Feast of the *Guardian Angels*, recommended to all *Catholicks* by *Paul* the fifth, in the last words of the *Breviary*, *they are prayed to defend them in War, that they may not periſh in Gods terrible judgement.* In the *Hymn* to the *Holy Apoſtles* they are prayed *to command the guilty to be looſed from their guilt, to heal unſound minds, and to encreaſe their vertues, that when Chriſt ſhall come, they may be partakers of eternal glory.* Theſe may ſuffice for a preſent taſte of the ſincerity of ſuch perſons who ſay, that in the *Church* of *Rome* they do nothing but *pray to the Saints to pray for them.* And it is a very pitiful ſhift that *Bellarmin* is put to, whereby to excuſe ſuch prayers as theſe, *That indeed as to the words themſelves they do imply more than praying to them to pray for us; but the ſenſe of the words*, he ſaith, *is no more.* But whence I pray muſt the people take the ſenſe of ſuch prayers as theſe are, if not from the ſignification of the words? If this were all, why in all this time that theſe prayers have been complained of, hath not their ſenſe been better expreſſed? Have not their *Breviaries* been often reviewed, if this had not been their meaning, why have they not been expunged all this while? Suppoſe then that any perſons in the *Roman Church* (as every one ought to do) take their ſenſe from the words, and do not force it upon them, and they pray according to the form preſcribed; do they well or ill in it? If they do ill in it, their Church is guilty of intolerable negligence, in not preventing it, if they do well, then their *Church* allows of

Commun. Apoſtol. p. 2. 9.

Bell. de Sanct. Beatit. l. 1. c. 17.

of more than praying to *Angels* and *Saints* to pray for them. *Bellarmins* inſtances of the *Apoſtles* in *Scripture* being ſaid *to ſave men*, do ſhew what ſhifts a bad cauſe will put a man to: For will any man in his wits ſay, the caſe is the ſame in ordinary *ſpeech* and in *prayer?* Is it all one, for a man to ſay, that his Staff helped him in his going, and to fall down upon his knees to pray to his Staff to help him? *God* did uſe the *Apoſtles* as *Inſtruments* on earth, to promote the ſalvation of mankind; but may we therefore *pray* to them now in Heaven, to ſave us? May we not truly ſay, that the *Sun* enlightens the world, but may we therefore pray to the *Sun* to enlighten us? No, the *Sun* is but *Gods Inſtrument*, and our addreſſes muſt be in prayer to the Supreme *Lord* over all. But to take his own explication of praying to them for theſe things: i. e. *praying to them that they would pray to God for them, as we deſire one another to pray:* Would not that man be condemned of groſs *Idolatry*, or prodigious folly, who inſtead of deſiring his *Friends* to *pray* to *God* for the pardon of his ſins, and the aſſiſtance of *Divine Grace*, ſhould fall down on his knees before them and ſay to them, *I pray you pardon my ſins, and aſſiſt me with the Grace of God?* What would S. *Paul* have ſaid to ſuch men that ſhould have asked ſuch things of him, who yet ſaith, *that he was an inſtrument of ſaving ſome?*

§. 14.

§. 14. 2. Supposing this were all that were done and allowed in the *Roman Church*, yet this would not excuse them: for their practice is very different in their *Invocation* of *Saints*, from *desiring our Brethren on earth to pray for us*. And I cannot but wonder, how any men of common sense can suffer themselves to be imposed upon so easily in this matter. For is there really no difference between S. *Pauls* desiring his Brethren *to pray for him*, as he often did; and a mans falling down upon his knees with all the solemnity of devotion he uses to God himself, to S. *Paul*, to desire him to pray for him, when he was present upon earth, and did certainly know what he desired of him? Suppose in the midst of the solemn devotions of the *Church*, where S. *Peter* or S. *Paul* had been present, the *Letanies* of the *Church* had been then as they are now; and after they had prayed to the persons of the *Holy Trinity*, the people should with the same postures, and expressions of devotion, have immediately turned themselves to the *Apostles*, and cryed only, *Peter and Paul pray for us*; do you think, this would have been acceptable to them? No doubt S. *Peter* would have been less pleased with this, than with *Cornelius*, only *falling down before him*; and *yet then he bid him stand up, I my self also am a man.* They who impute this only to his *modesty*, will not allow him to carry this *vertue* to Heaven with him; for they suppose him to be very well pleased with that honor in Heaven, which he refused on earth. And S. *Paul* would have rent his garments and

The difference between praying to Saints in Heaven, and desiring men on Earth to pray for us.

Acts 10. 25, 26.

Acts 14. 14, 15. and cryed out, as he did to the men of *Lystra*, *Why do ye these things; we also are men of like passions with you?* They would not receive any honor, that might in the least seem to incroach upon the *divine honor*; and yet they might, upon better grounds, have done it to them on earth, than now in heaven; because they were then sure they heard them, which now they can never be. And would it not be a senseless thing, to desire some excellent person in the *Indies*, when we are at our solemn devotion to pray for us, because it is possible, God may at the same time reveal our minds to him? I would willingly be informed, if we had assurance of the *Sanctity* of a person in this life, as great as they have in the *Church* of *Rome* of those they invocate; whether there would be any evil at all in publick places of worship, and at the time used for the service of God, to set such a person up in some higher place of the Church, to burn incense before him, to prostrate themselves with hands and eyes lifted up to him; if at last they pretended, that all that time they only *prayed to him, to pray for them?* And certainly a good man is much more the *Image of God*, and deserves more reverence than all the artificial *Images* of *Saints*, or of *God* himself. If they will condemn this, they may conceive, that supposing *they only prayed to Saints in their devotions to pray for them*, this would not excuse them: For they do it in those places, at such times, and in such a manner as highly incroaches upon the worship and service due to God alone.

§. 15

§ 15. 2. I now come to consider, whether the answer given by S. *Austin* will vindicate them; and whether Invocation of Saints, as it is now practised in the *Church* of *Rome*, were allowed, or in *use* then? Here he tells us, *That* Faustus *the Manichean calumniates the Catholicks (the word is* S. *Austins* he saith, and we do not quarrel with the word, but that they are not such *Catholicks* as S. *Austin* speaks of) *because they honored the Memories or Shrines of Martyrs, charged them to have turned the Idols into Martyrs, whom they worshipped said he with like vows.* To shew how very far what S. *Austin* saith, is from justifying the present practices of the *Roman Church*, we need no more than barely to represent what S. *Austin* affirms, and what he denies. He affirms, that it was the custom of the *Christians* in his time to have their Religious Assemblies at the *Sepulchres* or *Memories* of the *Martyrs*; where the place it self would raise their affections, and quicken their love towards the *Martyrs* and towards *God*: but he utterly denies, that any *Religious worship* was performed to the *Martyrs*; for neither was any Sacrifice offered up to any of them, nor any other part of *Religious worship*: for thereupon he shews (which is very conveniently left out in the citation) *that not only Sacrifice, was refused by Saints and Angels, but any other Religious honour, which is due to God himself, as the Angel forbad S.* John *to fall down and worship him. All the worship* therefore, he saith, that they give to Saints is, *That of love and*

S. *Austin* no Friend to Invocation of Saints.

ſociety, and of the ſame kind which we give to holy men in this life, who are ready to ſuffer for the truth of the Goſpel. But that the worſhip of *Invocation* is expreſly excluded by S. *Auſtin*, appears by what himſelf ſaith on a like occaſion; where he ſhews the difference between the Gentiles worſhip and theirs: *They* (ſaith he) *build Temples, erect Altars, appoint Prieſts, and offer Sacrifices: but we erect no Temples to Martyrs, as to Gods; but Memories as to dead men, whoſe Spirits live with God; we raiſe no Altars on which to ſacrifice to Martyrs, but to one God, the God of Martyrs, as well as ours; at which, as men of God who have overcome the world by confeſſing him, they are named in their place and order, but are not invocated by the Prieſt who ſacrifices.* And elſwhere ſaith, *Whatever the Chriſtians do at the memories of the Martyrs, it is for ornaments to thoſe memories, not as any ſacred Rites or Sacrifices belonging to the dead as Gods: we therefore do not worſhip our Martyrs with Divine honors, nor with the faults of men, as the Gentiles did their Gods.* Which gave occaſion to *Lud. Vives* in his Notes on that *Chapter* to ſay, that *many Chriſtians in his time* (what ſort of *Catholicks* thoſe were, it is eaſie to gueſs, but to be ſure, none of S. *Auſtins*) *did no otherwiſe worſhip Saints, than they did God himſelf; neither could he ſee in many things any difference between the opinion they had of Saints, and what the Gentiles had of their Gods.* I cannot underſtand then, how S. *Auſtins* anſwer ſhould juſtifie that which he condemns: He denies that there was an *Invocation* of *Saints*,

Aug. de Civit. Dei, l. 20. c. 10.

L. 8. c. 27.

Saints, but only a *Commemoration* of them; the *Church* of *Rome* pleads for an *Invocation* of them, and condemns all those who deny it. So that his answer is very far from clearing the *Roman Church*, in the practice of *Invocation*, and the objection we make against it, that it doth parallel the *Heathen Idolatry*; for it grants, it would do so, if they gave to the *Saints* the *worship* due to *God*, of which he makes *Invocation* to be a part.

But after all this, can we imagine, that he should practise himself, contrary to his own doctrine? *Yes*, saith he) *he made a prayer to* S. Cyprian, *let Blessed* Cyprian *therefore help us in our prayers.* But is there no difference to be made, between such an *Apostrophe* to a person, in ones writing, and solemn supplication to him with all the solemnity of devotion, in the duties of Religious worship? If I should now say, Let S. *Austin* now help me in his prayers, while I am defending his constant opinion that *Invocation* is proper to *God* alone; would they take this for renouncing the *Protestant* doctrine, and embracing that of the *Church* of *Rome*? I doubt they would not think that I escaped the *Anathema* of the *Council* of *Trent* for all this. The Question between us, is not how far such wishes, rather than prayers, were thought allowable, being uttered occasionally, as S. *Austin* doth this to S *Cyprian*, but whether solemn *Invocation* of *Saints*, in the duties of Religious Worship, as it is now practised in the *Roman* Church, were ever practised in S. *Austins* time? and this we utterly

Aug. de bapt. c Don. l. 7. c. 1.

deny. We do not ſay, that they did not then believe, that the Saints in Heaven did pray for them; and that ſome of them did expreſs their wiſhes, that they would pray particularly for them: We do not ſay, that ſome ſuperſtitions did not creep in, after the Anniverſary meetings at the *Sepulchres* of the *Martyrs* grew in requeſt; for S. *Auſtin* himſelf ſaith, *that what they taught was one thing, and what they did bear with was another*, ſpeaking of the cuſtoms uſed at thoſe ſolemnities: But here we ſtand, and fix our foot againſt all oppoſition whatſoever, that there was no ſuch doctrine or practice allowed in the *Church* at that time, as is owned and approved at this day in the *Church* of *Rome*. But from S. *Auſtin* we are ſent to *Calvin*, whoſe authority (though never owned as infallible by us) we need not fear in this point: and I cannot but wonder, if he ſaw the words in *Calvin* or *Bellarmin*, that he would produce them. For *Calvin* doth there ſay, *That the Council of* Carthage *did forbid praying to Saints, leſt the publick prayers ſhould be corrupted by ſuch kind of addreſſes, Holy* Peter *pray for us*. If S. *Auſtin* were preſent in this *Council*, as my Adverſary ſaith *he was*, I wonder what advantage it will be to him from *Calvins* ſaying, that the *Council* did condemn and forbid thoſe prayers; which were in uſe by ſome of the people. But it ſeems, he takes the peoples part againſt the *Council*, and S. *Auſtin* too; and thinks it enough for them, to follow the practices condemned by *Councils* and *Fathers*; which we are ſure

C. Fauſt. l. 20. c. 2.

Calv. Inſtit. l. 3. c. 20. n. 22. Bull. de Beatit. ſanct. l. 1. c. 16.

ſure they do, and are glad to find ſo ingenuous a confeſſion of it. He may as well the next time bring S. *Auſtins* teſtimony for worſhipping *Martyrs* and *Images*, becauſe he ſaith, *he knew many who adored Sepulchres and Pictures*: and for the worſhip of *Angels*, becauſe he ſaith, *he had heard of many, who had tryed to go to God by praying to Angels, and were thought worthy to fall into deluſions.*

De Morib. Eccl. Cath. c. 34. Confeſſ. l. 10. cap. 42.

§. 16. But the ſtrangeſt effort of all the reſt, is what he hath reſerved to the laſt place, *viz. That the charge of Idolatry againſt them muſt be vain and groundleſs, becauſe if I be preſſed cloſe, I ſhall deny any one of theſe Negative points to be divine truths*; viz. *that honour is not to be given to the Images of Chriſt, and his Saints; that what appears to be bread in the Euchariſt, Is not the body of Chriſt; that it is not lawful to Invocate the Saints to pray for us.* But the anſwer to this is ſo eaſie, that it will not require much time to diſpatch it. For I do aſſert it to be an Article of my faith, *That God alone is to be worſhipped with divine and religious worſhip*: and he that cannot hence infer, that no created Being is to be worſhipped, hath the name of *reaſonable creature* given him to no purpoſe. What need we make *Negative Articles of faith*, where the *Affirmative* do neceſſarily imply them? If I believe that the *Scripture* is my only rule of faith, as I moſt firmly do; will any man that conſiders what he ſaith, require me to make *Negative Articles of faith*, that the *Pope* is not, *Tradition* is not, *Councils* are not, a private *Spirit* is not? for all theſe things

Of Negative points of faith.

are necessarily implied therein: And so for all particular doctrines, rejected by us upon this principle, we do not make them *Negative points of faith*; but we therefore refuse the belief of them, because not contained in our only rule of faith: On this account we reject the *Popes Supremacy*, *Transubstantiation*, *Infallibity of the present Church in delivering Points of Faith*, *Purgatory*, and other Fopperies imposed upon the belief of *Christians*. So that the short resolution of our *faith* is this, that we ought to believe nothing as an Article of faith, but what *God* hath revealed: and that the compleat revelation of *Gods* will to us, is contained in the *Bible*: and the resolution of our worship, is into this principle, that *God* alone is to be worshipped with diving and religious worship; and therefore whether they be *Saints* or *Angels*, *Sun*, *Moon* and *Stars*, whether the *Elements* of a Sacrament, or of the World, whether Crosses and Reliques, or Woods and Fountains, or any sort of Images; in a word, no Creature whatsoever is to be worshipped with religious worship, because that is proper to *God* alone. And if this principle will excuse them from *Idolatry*, I desire him to make the best of it. And if he gives no more satisfactory answer hereafter, than he hath already done, the greatest charity I can use to those of that *Church*, is to wish them repentance, which I most heartily do.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Of the hindrances of a good Life, and of Devotion in the Roman *Church.*

The Doctrines of the Roman *Church prejudicial to Piety. The Sacrament of Penance, as taught among them, destroys the necessity of a good life. The Doctrine of Purgatory takes away the care of it; as appears by the true stating it, and comparing that Doctrine with Protestants. How easie it is, according to them, for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. Purgatory dreadful to none, but poor and friendless. Sincerity of devotion hindred, by prayers in an unknown Tongue. The great absurdity of it manifested. The effects of our Ancestors devotion had been as great, if they had said their prayers in English. The language of prayer proved to be no indifferent thing, from S.* Pauls *arguments. No universal consent for prayers in an unknown tongue, by the confession of their own Writers. Of their doctrine of the efficacy of Sacraments, that it takes away all necessity of devotion, in the minds of the receivers. This complained of by* Cassander *and* Arnaud; *but proved against them, to be the doctrine of the* Roman *Church, by the Canons of the Council of* Trent. *The great easiness of getting Grace by their Sacraments. Of their discouraging*

the reading the Scriptures. A ſtanding rule of devotion neceſſary. None ſo fit to give it, as God himſelf: This done by him in the Scriptures. All perſons therefore concerned to read them. The Arguments againſt reading the Scriptures, would have held againſt the publiſhing them in a language known to the people. The dangers as great then, as ever have been ſince. The greateſt prudence of the Roman *Church is wholly to forbid the the Scriptures, being acknowledged by their wiſeſt men, to be ſo contrary to their Intereſt. The confeſſion of the Cardinals at* Bononia, *to that purpoſe. The avowed practice of the* Roman *Church herein, directly contrary to that of the Primitive: although the reaſons were as great then, from the danger of Hereſies. This confeſſed by their own Writers.*

Of the Sacrament of Penance deſtroying the neceſſity of a good life.

§. 1. 2. THe ſecond Reaſon I gave why perſons run ſo great a hazard of their ſalvation in the communion of the *Roman Church* was, becauſe that *Church* is guilty of ſo great corruption of the *Chriſtian Religion*, by opinions and practices which are very apt to hinder a good life, which is neceſſary to ſalvation. But,

1. *This neceſſity* I ſaid, was taken off by their making the *Sacrament of Penance* joyned with contrition, ſufficient for ſalvation. Here he ſaith, *That Proteſtants do make contrition alone, which is leſs, ſufficient for ſalvation, and our Church allowing confeſſion and abſolution (which make the Sacrament of Penance) in caſe of trouble of conſcience, they*

they being added to contrition, cannot make it of a malignant nature. To this I answer: That contrition alone is not by us made sufficient for salvation. For we believe, that as no man can be saved without true repentance, so that true repentance doth not lye meerly in contrition for sins. For *godly sorrow* in Scripture, is said, *to work repentance to salvation, not to be repented of*; and it cannot be the cause and effect both together. *Repentance* in Scripture implyes a *forsaking of sin*, (as it were very easie to prove, if it be thought necessary) and without this we know not what ground any man hath to hope for the pardon of it, although he confess it, and be absolved a thousand times over; and have remorse in his mind for it, when he doth confess it. And therefore I had cause to say, that they of the Church of *Rome* destroy the necessity of a good life, when they declare a man to be in a state of salvation, if he hath a bare *contrition* for his sins, and confess them to the Priest, and be absolved by him. For to what end should a man put himself to the trouble of mortifying his passions and forsaking his sins? if he commits them again, he knows a present remedy, *toties quoties*; it is but confessing with sorrow, and upon absolution he is as whole, as if he had not sinned. And is it possible to imagine a doctrine that more effectually overthrows the *necessity* of a *good life*, than this doth? I cannot but think, if this doctrine were true, all the Precepts of *Holiness* in the *Christian Religion* were insignificant things: But this is a doctrine fitted to make all

2 Cor. 7. 10.

that

that are *bad*, and willing to continue so, to be their *Proselytes*; when so cheap and easie a way of salvation is believed by them: especially if we enquire into the explication of this doctrine among the *Doctors* of that *Church*. I cannot better express this, than in the words of Bishop *Taylor* (whom he deservedly calls *an eminent leading man among the Protestants*) who after having mentioned their doctrines about contrition, "The sequel of all (he saith) is this, "that if a man live a wicked life for sixty or "eighty years together, yet if in the article of "his death, sooner than which God (say they) "hath not commanded him to repent, by be-"ing a little sorrowful for his sins, then re-"solving for the present that he will do so no "more; and though this sorrow hath in it no "love of God, but only a fear of Hell, and a "hope that God will pardon him; this, "if the Priest absolves him, doth instant-"ly pass him into a state of salvation. The "Priest with two Fingers and a Thumb "can do his work for him; only he must "be greatly prepared and disposed to re-"ceive it: greatly we say according to the "sense of the *Roman Church*; for he must be "attrite, or it were better, he were contrite; "one act of grief, a little one, and that not for "one sin more than for another, and this at the "end of a wicked long life, at the time of our "death will make all sure. Upon these terms, it "is a wonder that all wicked men in the world "are not Papists, where they may live so merri-"ly, and dye so securely, and are out of all "danger,

Dissuasive. p. 1. ch. 2. p. 81.

"danger, unleſs peradventure they dye very "ſuddenly, which becauſe ſo very few do, the "venture is eſteemed nothing, and it is a thou- "ſand to one on the ſinners ſide.

But we dare not flatter men ſo into eternal miſery; we cannot but declare to them the neceſſity of a ſincere repentance and holy life, in order to ſalvation: and that we cannot abſolve thoſe, whom God hath declared he will not abſolve. Indeed for the ſatisfaction of truly penitent ſinners, our *Church* approves of applying the *Promiſes* of *Pardon* in *Scripture* to the particular caſe of thoſe perſons; which is that we mean by *abſolution*. But if the Church of *Rome* pretend they can abſolve whether *God* will or no, we muſt leave *God* and *them* to diſpute that Point.

§. 2. 2. I ſaid the care of a good life was taken off among them, by ſuppoſing an expiation of ſin (by the prayers of the living) after death. *No*, ſaith he, *it is rather apt to increaſe it; becauſe of the temporal pains the ſinner is to ſuſtain after death, if there be not a perfect expiation of ſin in this life by works of penance: and although he be aſcertained by faith, that he may be holpen by the charitable ſuffrages of the faithful living, yet this is no more encouragement to him to ſin, than it would be to a Spend-thrift to run into debt, and to be caſt into priſon, becauſe he knows he may be relieved by the charity of his friends. If he were ſure there were no priſon for him, that would be an encouragement indeed to play the Spend-thrift, and this* he ſaith,

The doctrine of Purgatory takes away the care of a good life.

ſaith, *is the caſe of the Proteſtants in denyal of Purgatory.* One would think by this anſwer, we *Proteſtants* had a very pleaſant *Religion*, and that we held nothing that could affright a ſinner from continuing in his ſins, becauſe we deſtroy *Purgatory:* I pray, *Madam*, ask him whether he be in earneſt, that this *is the caſe of the Proteſtants in the denyal of Purgatory*; that the ſinner *is ſure there is no priſon for him.* Do the *Proteſtants* believe that there is no Hell, or that Hell is no priſon, or that it is leſs terrible than Purgatory: We had thought there had been ſomething more dreadful in the *torments of Hell*, than in the flames of *Purgatory.* But if our plain doctrine, that every impenitent ſinner muſt expect no leſs than eternal vengeance in another world, will not prevail upon men to leave their ſins, and lead a good life; can we imagine a groundleſs fiction of *Purgatory* ſhould ever do it? Eſpecially, conſidering the true ſtating of the doctrine of *Purgatory* among them, by which we ſhall eaſily diſcern what obligation it layes upon men to *Holineſs* of life. "There "are (ſay they) two ſorts of ſins which men "are guilty of, ſome of which are in their own "nature *venial*, and ſo do not deſerve eternal "puniſhment, and for theſe a general and ver-"tual repentance is ſufficient: but there are "other which they call *mortal ſins*, which have "a debt and obligation to eternal puniſhment "belonging to them; but this *eternal puniſh-"ment* is changed into *temporal*, by the *Sacra-"ment of Penance*; but ſtill this *temporal* pu-"niſhment, muſt be undergone either in *this life*,

"or

"or that *to come*; if a man do not ſatisfie in "*this life*, and cannot get help enough out of "the *ſtock* of the *Church* to do it for him; "there is no remedy, to *Purgatory* he muſt go: "and if he be not helped by his Friends on "earth, God knows how long he may ſtay "there; but then he is to blame that he took "no more care for his ſoul when he lived; if "not by a holy life, yet by leaving no more "to thoſe whoſe Office it ſhould be, to procure "him a deliverance thence. Judge now, *Madam*, if this be not a very frightful doctrine, eſpecially to thoſe, who are *poor* and *friendleſs*. But in caſe a man be rich enough, to provide *Maſſes* to be ſaid for his ſoul; and that he hath a good *ſtock* of *Indulgences* before hand, for ſome *thouſands* of years, he may make a pretty tolerable ſhift in *Purgatory*, eſpecially in theſe laſt *Ages* of the world; wherein it is probable, it may not be near ſo long to the day of judgement (when the final ſentence is to be pronounced) as he hath got years of *Indulgences* already. I pray what need a perſon be afraid of, that lives a very bad life, according to theſe principles? Muſt he ſuffer for his *Original ſin?* No, that, guilt and puniſhment and all, is clear done away in *Baptiſm*. Muſt he ſuffer for his *Venial ſins?* That were ſtrange, if he had never any *general repentance* for them. Need he be afraid of the dreadful ſentence of the day of judgement, *Go ye curſed into everlaſting flames?* He is a *Fool* indeed, that by a little preſent *contrition* and *confeſſion*, will not obtain *abſolution* from a *Prieſt*; and then in a trice the *eternal* flames

are

are extinguiſhed, and only ſome *temporal* puniſhment ſucceeds in the *room* of them. But it would ſeem ſomewhat hard to a voluptuous man however to be put to ſevere *penances*; is there no remedy in this caſe? Yéa, there is a *ſtock* in the *Church*; and if he will not procure help for himſelf thence by ſome plenary *Indulgences*, if he will not bear it here, he muſt in another world. What then? Is he paſt all hope of remedy there? That is according to his *Purſe* and *Friends*. *How eaſie is it for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God?* But we have no ſuch eaſie way of eſcaping the miſeries of another life: we dare not tell men they may be relieved there by *Maſſes* and *Sacrifices*, and I know not what: our doctrine is plain and agreeable to the moſt obvious and eaſie ſenſe of the *Goſpel*, if men be good here, they ſhall be happy afterwards; if they be bad, and continue ſo, they ſhall be certainly miſerable, and unavoidably ſo. But for thoſe who are neither good nor bad, (if any ſuch can be) neither ſincere nor hypocrites, neither penitent nor impenitent, we leave them to take care of them: our Saviour hath only declared, that thoſe who are good, ſincere, and penitent, ſhall be happy; thoſe who are otherwiſe, muſt be miſerable: if they have found out ſome wayes for them to eſcape notwithſtanding, at their peril be it, who relye upon them. But for others, we underſtand no more how puniſhment in another life ſhould remain after the guilt of ſin is pardoned, than how a ſhadow ſhould continue, when the body is gone: for puniſhment follows,

ſollows guilt, as the ſhadow the body. And if pardon of ſin ſignifies any thing, it is taking away the puniſhment we were obnoxious to by reaſon of ſin. But how that man ſhould be ſaid to have his *debt forgiven*, who is caſt into Priſon for it: only whereas he might have lain and rotted there, his *Creditor* tells him, he ſhall endure the ſame miſery, but he ſhall eſcape at laſt, is a thing no man would believe, who ſuffered in ſuch a caſe. He might indeed ſay, that he did not exerciſe the utmoſt rigour of *Juſtice*, but would hardly be brought to magnifie the infinite clemency and kindneſs of his *Creditor*. But we that deſire to underſtand the way of ſalvation as it is delivered by our *Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, and to be ſaved in that way, cannot for our hearts underſtand any more by his doctrine, but that men ſhall be ſaved, if they believe and obey his doctrine, and ſhall be condemned, if they do it not. We find nothing of *half ſaving* and *half damning* men, ſuch as the *ſtate* of *Purgatory* is believed to be in the *Church* of *Rome*. For the pains of perſons therein, are ſaid to be as great as of the damned in Hell; and yet all this while *God* is their *Friend*, and they are ſure to be ſaved. They had need in ſuch a caſe to call in the help of their *Friends* on earth, if *God* be ſo ill a *Friend* in *Heaven*.

And can he not believe, that it is a far greater encouragement to a *Spend-thrift* to be told indeed of a dreadful Priſon, but ſuch as if he leaves but money behind him to imploy his friends in begging his pardon, he ſhall be ſurely

ſurely delivered; than to be aſſured if he continues his folly, there will be no redemption or hopes of deliverance, when he is once caſt into it. I dare appeal to any one who can but underſtand what we ſpeak of, whether of theſe two, is the more probable way of reclaiming a man from riotous courſes? but that which is beyond this, is, that the one is moſt certainly true, the other but a meer figment of the brains of men, who have contrived a way to bring wicked men to Heaven at laſt, although ſomewhat the farther way about, and it muſt coſt them dear for their *Friends* to help them through.

Sincerity of devotion hindered by prayers in an unknown Tongue.

§. 3. 3. After I had ſhewed how much the neceſſity, and care of a good life, were obſtructed by the principles of the *Roman Church*; I proceeded to ſhew, how the *ſincerity of devotion* was hindered among them, by ſeveral particulars.

1. *By prayers in a langnage which many underſtand not.* To this he anſwers, *If I ſpeak of private prayers, all Catholicks are taught to ſay them in their Mother Tongue: If of the publick prayers of the Church, he underſtands not why it may not be done with as much ſincerity of devotion, the people joyning their intention and particular prayers with the Prieſt, as their Embaſſadour to God, as if they underſtood him; he is ſure the effects of a ſincere devotion, for nine hundred years together, which this manner of worſhip produced in this Nation, were much different from thoſe we have ſeen ſince the reducing the publick Liturgy into Engliſh; for which he inſtances in building and*

and endowing Churches, Colledges, Religious houses, and the conversion of several Nations by English Missionaries. But this, he saith, *is a matter of Discipline, and not to be regulated by the fancies of private men, but the judgement of the Church: and withal is confessed by some Protestants, that most Sects of Christians have the Scriptures, Liturgies and Rituals in a Tongue unknown, but to the Learned; and therefore according to St.* Austin, *it is insolent madness to dispute that which is frequented by the whole Church through the world.* For our more distinct proceeding in answer to this, three things are to be considered: 1. Whether praying in a known or unknown tongue, do more conduce to devotion? 2. Whether this whole matter be a thing left in the power of the *Church* to determine? 3. Whether prayers in an unknown tongue, be universally received in all other parts of the *Christian* world?

Preface to the *Polyglott* Bible, 1655.

1. Whether of these conduce more to devotion, is our main enquiry. And if praying in an *unknown tongue* doth so, I wonder he tells us, *that all Catholicks are taught to say them in their Mother-tongue*: Why so I pray? Is it that by understanding what they speak, their minds might be more attentive, and their affections more raised in the desires of the things they pray for? And will not the same arguments more hold for publick prayer, wherein all the Congregation are to joyn together? So that their private prayers condemn their publick, unless *Latin* in the *Church* be of greater force, than uttered in a *Closet*.

But can it enter into the minds of any men, who consider what the end of meeting together to *pray* is, that such an end should as much, or more, be attained, where people know not what they say, as where they do? If all the business of *Christian worship* were only to patter over a few words (as if there were no difference between *prayers* and *charms*) what he saith, were to some purpose: but that is so dishonourable a thing to *Christian Religion*, that it is hard to say, whether they have more corrupted the *doctrine* or the *devotion* of the *Christian Church*. If I saw a company of *Indians* met together, with their *Priest* among them, using many antick gestures and Mimical postures, and speaking many words which the people muttered after him, but understood not what they said; I might probably suspect they were *conjuring*, but should hardly believe them, if they called that *praying*. I could not but enquire of them, what they meant by *praying?* If they told me, saying so many hard words, which they understood not, I had done with them, but should shrewdly suspect the *knavery* of their *Priests*. If they told me, by *praying* they meant, *expressing their desires of the things they stood in need of, to the God they worshipped*; I could not but ask of them, whether it were not necessary for them to *know* what it was they asked, or how could they desire they knew not what? Or whether the *God* they worshipped, understood only that *one tongue*, and so they were fain to speak to him, in his own language?

This

This I confeſs, were a ſufficient reaſon; and in that caſe the people were to be pitied, if they could not learn that tongue themſelves. But ſuppoſing all languages equally known to him we make our addreſſes to, why ſhould not the people uſe that, which they underſtand themſelves? Are their prayers like counterfeit *Jewels*, that the leſs they underſtand them, the better they like them? It may juſtly give men ſome ſuſpicion, that there are not fair dealings, where ſo little light is allowed to judge by: and *that devotion* commended moſt, which *Ignorance* is the Mother of. We think it as unreaſonable, to deſire the people to ſay *Amen* to prayers they know not the meaning of, as for men to ſet their hands to *Petitions* without reading what is contained in them. It is a great chance if they do not miſtake, to their own great prejudice, and do what they repent of afterwards. We declare, that our meeting together to worſhip *God*, is to joyn together our hearty prayers; which the more the people underſtand, the better their minds are ſatisfied in what they deſire, and the more fervent will their ſupplications be. If it be enough for *ſome to underſtand* them, it may as well be enough for *ſome to pray* them; if their *prayers* who underſtand them, prevail for thoſe who do not, then it is no matter at all whether they be *preſent* or no; unleſs the efficacy of the others prayers be confined within the walls where they meet. And if *their* prayers be moſt prevalent, who underſtand moſt, then it were ten times better, if all the

people understood what they prayed for: and it must necessarily follow, that praying in an unknown tongue, is a great obstructer of the devotion of the people, and that which hinders the efficacy of their prayers. If it be enough for the people to be present, and to pray their own private prayers there in publick, to what End is there any publick *Liturgy* at all? Why should not all of them be at their private prayers together? Why should the *Priest* with his *Jargon* of hard words interrupt them? for it is no other, to them who know not what he saith; and why may they not as well say their private prayers at the *chiming of Bells*, as at the *words* of a *Priest?* for they understand both alike, and both seem to sound as such wise people will have them.

But he tells us, *The effects of this devotion were admirable in the charitable and pious works of our Ancestors, who used this way so many Ages together.* I pray *Madam*, ask him, whether he really thinks, they would have done none of those things, if they had said their *prayers* in *English?* If they would not, I do much admire the force of the *Latin Tongue:* If they would, then that was not the cause, and these things do not prove what they were intended for: And so *Tenterden Steeple* was not the cause of *Goodwin Sands*. We do not go about to disparage our *Ancestors*, we bless *God* for the good they did; but do not think that doth oblige us to think them infallible in their opinions, or without fault in all their practices: But our true

Ancestors

Anceſtors in *Religion*, are *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* and the *Primitive Church*; and all theſe are yielded to be of our ſide, by the moſt zealous *Adverſaries* we have: and give us leave to think their examples ought to have more force with us, than any other whatſoever. We pretend not, to be wiſer than they were; nor to know what is more expedient for *devotion* than they: We are content to be condemned for *error*, with thoſe who are by all Chriſtians acknowledged to be *infallible*; and to want *devotion*, where we follow the examples of the moſt *holy perſons* the world ever had. If the practice of the Primitive *Church* in this point, were not given us for the firſt ſix hundred years and more, it were an eaſie matter to evince it by expreſs teſtimonies: but that is not the thing inſiſted on, but that this is a matter of *Diſcipline*, and the *Church* hath the power to determine it in one *Age* as well as another.

§. 4. Which is the next thing to be conſidered. Here I ſhall deſire but two principles to reſolve this by. 1. That the *Churches power* is only to *edification* and not to deſtruction; for this was as much as the *Apoſtles* challenged to themſelves, and I hope none dare challenge more: but this is a principle of natural reaſon, that no power in a ſociety ought to be extended beyond the benefit of it, or to contradict the end or deſign of it. 2. That the *Apoſtles* were the moſt competent Judges of what made for the *Edification* of the Church; and what they declared to tend to that end, no ſucceeding perſons ought to condemn as contrary to it. This de-

The language of prayer, no matter of diſcipline. 2 Cor. 10. 8.

pends upon that infallible *Spirit* which the *Apoſtles* had, and the mighty care in them of the *Churches* good; which we cannot think any ſince them, can exceed them in. Theſe things being ſuppoſed, we are only to conſider, whether the *Apoſtle* hath not delivered his ſenſe in our preſent ſubject, *viz.* that prayers in an unknown tongue are contrary to the *Edification* of the *Church?* It ſeems ſomewhat hard to us, to be put to prove a matter ſo evident, from
1 Cor. 14. St. *Paul*: and we could not imagine, any would go about to reconcile prayers in an unknown tongue, to that Diſcourſe of his, but thoſe who think they can reconcile the worſhip of *Images*, to the ſecond Commandment. The abuſe St. *Paul* corrects, with ſo much ſharpneſs, in the *Church* of *Corinth*, was an impertinent uſe of the gift of *Tongues*; ſuch I mean as did not tend to the *Edification* of the *Church*: as for Inſtance, one man made a long Harangue in *Hebrew*, and pleaſed himſelf mightily in the ſound of the words, when not a perſon there, it may be, underſtood a word that he ſaid; another of a ſudden begins a Hymn, in *Syriack* or *Caldee*; another falls a praying, in *Ethiopick*; but all this while, no man interprets what theſe ſeveral men ſaid: to what purpoſe is all this, ſaith the Apoſtle; only
1 Cor. 14. for by-ſtanders, to think they were *Children* or
20, 23. *mad men*: could they imagine *God* gave them theſe gifts of tongues, to make uncouth and inſignificant ſounds with, where the people were met together for the worſhip of *God?* If they were ſo much tickled with the noiſe, they might make

make that at home, and not in the *Church* of *God*, where *all things ought to be done to Edification.* For they met together as a company of reasonable men to receive some benefit that might be common to them all; and therefore the gift of tongues, in a society of Christians, could be of no use without an *Interpreter.* But lest all this should seem to be spoken only of instruction of the people, and not of prayer to God, and that the case were not alike in both these, he adds, *If I pray in an unknown tongue, my Spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful. i. e.* I may exercise my gift, but it is to no use at all in the *Church.* How so? "One of the *Roman Church* might have told "St. *Paul*, when I see him pray, and know "what he is doing, may I not joyn my intenti-"on of praying with his, as our Embassadour, "and pray my own private prayers at the same "time that he doth? I know the substance of "what he designs to pray for; and although I "do not know his meaning, God knows mine: "and therefore I can see no hindrance of "devotion at all in this, that when one begins "a prayer in an unknown tongue, all the "people fall upon their knees, and pray too: This is the plain answer they must give St. *Paul*, who justifie prayers in an unknown tongue. But we are content with St. *Pauls* judgement in this case, and the reason of it; that the acts belonging to the worship of God in the *Church* ought to be of so common concernment, that all may have a share in them, and receive the benefit by them:

V. 28.
V. 26.
V. 2, 3, 4, 5, &c.
V. 14.

Or else they were far better hold their peace. It is very impertinent to say, that the *Apostle* speaks only of extraordinary gifts, and not of the settled and ordinary devotions of the *Church*. For the case is the same, where the language is not understood, whether it be spoken by a *Miracle* or not: And the *Apostle* layes down a general rule from this particular case, *that all things must be done to edifying*, which it appears he judges the use of an unknown language not to be. And if after all this, it be in the *Churches* power to reverse the *Apostles* decree as to praying in an unknown language, they may use the very same power, as to all other Offices of *Religion*, and may command preaching to be in a tongue as unknown as praying; that so the people may meet together, and pray, and hear Sermons, and understand never a word, for their great edification. Unless among us *God* should put it into their hearts to speak *English*, whether they would or no, as was once said by an ignorant person on the like occasion. If all that is intended in the prayers of the people, be only *an intention to pray*, whatever the words be, *Abracadabra* might serve to pray with, as well as *Ave Maria*, and the old Womans saying of it, *Avi Mari gratia plinam dams ticum, benedicta tu in mulabs yeth Benedictus fructus frentris tui, Sweet Jesus, Amen*; was as effectual a prayer if she meant it so, as could be uttered by the most skilful Priest.

§. 5.

§. 5. 3. *But the universal consent of the Christian Church is pleaded for this practice, Protestants only excepted; and therefore it is insolent madness in them to oppose it, as S.* Austin *saith:* but we had however rather follow S. *Paul*, who saith it were madness to practise it. But I assure you, *Madam*, we are not to take all things for granted which are told us by them, concerning the opinions and practices of the *Eastern Churches:* (as I may in time discover) *but in this*, he saith, *our own Protestant Authors of the Bible of many Languages* Lond. A. D. 1655. *do confess that in most of the Sects of the Christians, they have not only the Scriptures: but also the Liturgies and Rituals in a tongue unknown but to the learned*: from which he concludes, this to be an universal practice both in the *Primitive Greek* and *Latin Churches*, and in these latter Sects of *Eastern Christians*. It were a very pleasant enquiry, How in the *Primitive Greek* and *Latin Churches* the Service could be in an *unknown Language*, when *Greek* and *Latin* were the *Mother Tongues* of those Churches? Doth he think they did not understand their own *Mother Tongues?* How many of their own Writers have confessed, that in the *Primitive Churches* all publick Offices of Religion were performed in the proper language of every Countrey; which in express words is affirmed by *Origen* against *Celsus:* and some of the *Church* of *Rome* have been so ingenuous to confess, it were much better that custom were restored again. So *Cassander* affirms of *Cajetan*, and that he being reproved

No universal consent, for prayers in an unknown tongue.

Orig. c. Cel. l. 8. p. 402.

Cassandr. consult. art. 24.

proved for it ſaid, *he learned this doctrine from S.* Paul, 1 *Cor.* 14. And the Title of the twenty eighth Chapter of *Caſſander* his *Liturgicks* is, *That the Antients read the Canonical Prayer, and the conſecration of the Euchariſt, ſo as the people did underſtand it and ſay* Amen. *Lyra* ſaith, *That all publick Offices of Religion were, in the Primitive Church, performed in the Vulgar Tongue.* So that it was not upon the account of any ſanctity in the *Greek* or *Latin*, that they were more uſed, but becauſe they were more generally underſtood. On which account *Pope Innocent* the third gave ſtrict command, that where people of different Languages did inhabit, care ſhould be taken to provide men able to adminiſter Sacraments, and *inſtruct* them in their ſeveral tongues; which Decree of his is inſerted in the *Canon Law*; and was not intended out of honor to the *Greek* and *Latin* Tongues only, but for the advantage of the people. So likewiſe *John* the eighth yielded to the *Prince* of *Moravia*, to have their *Liturgie* in the *Sclavonian* Tongue, becauſe S. *Paul* ſaith, *Let every Tongue praiſe the Lord*; which is the reaſon given by the *Pope* in his Letter extant in *Baronius:* and not meerly on the account of a preſent neceſſity, for want of *Prieſts* who could read *Latin*, as *Bellarmin* conjectures; for he appoints it ſhould be firſt read in the *Sclavonian* Tongue. If this were then a *Catholick practice*, theſe *Popes* were hugely to blame to give way to the breach of it. And *Walafridus Strabo* ſaith, in his time *among the* Scythians, *the divine Offices*

Lyra in 1 Cor. 14.

Baron. Tom. 10. *A.* 880. *n.* 16.

Walafrid Strabo de reb. Eccl. c. 7.

were

were performed in the German Tongue; which was common to them and the *Germans*. *But our own Protestant Writers*, he saith, *own this to be in use in the most Sects of Christians*. I have endeavoured to find this confession in the Preface cited by him, but I cannot meet with it; and the Learned Bishop who writ it, understood these things, better than to write so. It is true he saith (not in the *Preface*, but *Proleg.* 13. *n.* 19.) *that the Syriack Tongue is the Tongue of the Learned, among the Christians throughout the East*; *as appears by the Liturgies and divine Offices, which are almost every where performed in this Language*; *although it be the Mother-tongue now, only to a few about Mount* Libanus: But any one who enquires into a *Catholick practice*, must not meerly give an account of the most *Eastern Christians* of whom he there speaks. For there are many considerable *Churches* besides these, which do to this day use their own language in their *Liturgies*; as their own Writers attest: But I need not go about to prove this, since *Bellarmin* confesseth, *That the Armenians*, *Ethiopians*, *Egyptians*, *Russians and others do it*; but he saith, *he is no more moved by these, than by the practice of Protestants*: but we cannot but be moved so far by it, as thereby to see that the practice of the *Church* of *Rome* is no more a *Catholick* practice, than it is founded either on *Scripture* or *Reason*.

§. 6. I said the sincerity of *devotion* was obstructed, by making the *efficacy of Sacraments to depend on the bare Administration, whether our minds be prepared for them or not*. *This*, he saith,

Of their doctrine of the efficacy of Sacraments.

faith, *he had rather look upon as a miſtake, than a calumny, having never read any Council wherein this doctrine is defined; and as to the Sacrament of Penance (which he ſuppoſeth I chiefly mean) the Council of* Trent *hath determined it to be a calumny for any to ſay, that according to their doctrine it doth confer grace, without the good motion of the receiver. Madam,* I either expected he ſhould have underſtood the doctrine of his own party better, or been more ingenuous in confeſſing it. For my quarrel had no particular reſpect to the *Sacrament of Penance*, more than to any other *Sacrament* of theirs; and if I can make it appear, that it is their doctrine, that the efficacy of Sacraments doth not depend upon the preparation of the receiver, but the bare Adminiſtration, or the *external work done*, I need not add much to ſhew how much this doth obſtruct the *ſincerity of devotion*. It had been an opinion long received in the Schools, although with different ways of explication, that the *Sacraments* of the new *Law* differed from thoſe of the old in this, that the efficacy of thoſe of the old Law in conferring grace, did depend upon what they called *opus operantis*, i. e. the *faith* and *devotion* of the receiver of them; but that the *Sacraments* of the *new Law* did confer grace *ex opere operato*, i. e. *by the thing it ſelf*, without any dependance therein upon the internal motion or preparation of mind in him that did partake of them. This doctrine began to be in a particular manner applied to the *Maſs*, becauſe that contained *Chriſt* in a more

eſpecial

especial way than any other *Sacrament*; thence it was believed and asserted, that it did produce saving effects, as remission of sins and true grace, although we should suppose an impossible thing, that no man in the world had any true Grace; as Baptism takes away original sin, and gives grace to the Infant baptized, whatever the sins of men are. These are the expressions of one of their profound Doctors. And therefore they distinguished the efficacy of the *work done*, not barely from the *dignity* of the *Priest*, and the *merit* of the *receiver*, but from the *devotion* and *preparation* of mind with which the receiver came. Which *Bellarmin* himself cannot deny, only two things he saith to take off the *odium* of it. One is, *That they do not wholly exclude them, but only from the efficacy of Sacraments; which*, he saith, *is effectually proved by the case of Infants, that it doth not depend upon any quality of the receiver:* the other, *That though the Mass, as a Sacrament, may not profit those who are not duly prepared, yet as a Sacrifice it may.* By which these things are evident: 1. That the efficacy of the *Sacraments* in conferring grace, doth not at all depend upon the qualification of the receiver. 2. That although, upon other accounts, some dispositions are required in adult persons, to receive the benefit of them as *Sacraments*; yet the effect of the *Mass* as a *Sacrifice*, is not at all hindred by want of them. If it were a thing possible, I would willingly understand what they mean by *Sacraments* conferring grace *ex opere operato* (which are not only the express terms of

Gabr. Biel sup. Canon. Missæ lect. 26. lit. 6.

Bell. de effect. Sacram. l. 2. c. 1.

Contil. Trident. Sess 7. Can. 8. of the *Council* of *Trent*, but an *Anathema* is denounced againſt any one who denies it.) For the manner of it is declared by themſelves, to be unintelligible; and no wonder, for they ſuppoſe *Grace* to be contained in the *Sacraments* (and it is defined with an *Anathema* by *Can. 6.* the *Council* of *Trent*) and by the *Sacrament* of it ſelf it is conveyed into the heart of a man: But whether it be contained as in an *univocal cauſe*, as in an *inſtrument*, or as in a *ſign*; Whether it be conferred by the *Sacraments* as *Phyſical*, or as *Moral Cauſes*; Whether by a *power inherent* in the *Sacraments* themſelves, or a *power aſſiſtent* concurring with the *Sacraments*; Whether it be conveyed as *Phyſick* in a *Cup*, or as *Heat* to Water by a *red hot Iron*, or as healing to the perſons who touched the hemm of our Saviours Garment; Whether they produce only a next diſpoſition to grace, or not the grace it ſelf, but the union of grace with the ſoul, or (which is the moſt common opinion) that Phyſical action whereby grace is produced which doth truly, really and phyſically depend upon the Sacraments (meaning thereby the external action of adminiſtring them) Theſe are looked on as great Riddles among them, and ſo they ought to be: *But theſe things*, ſay they, *need not be determined, nor the manner of the thing be underſtood, no more than thoſe who were miraculouſly healed, did the manner of the cure*, a very proper inſtance, if the matter of fact were as evident in one, as it is in the other. But if I ſhould ſay, that the wearing a Cap of a certain

tain figure would certainly convey wit and understanding into a man, and the meer putting it on was enough to produce the effect: and a person should tell me it was an unintelligible thing, were it enough think you, as *Bellarmin* doth in this case, to run to other mysteries of faith and nature which are as hard as that? By this consequence, no man ought to be charged with believing absurd and unreasonable things; and the Trinity and Resurrection shall serve to justifie the *Fables* of the *Alcoran* as well as the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, and the efficacy of the Sacraments *ex opere operato*. We could easily dispense with the barbarous terms and ungrammaticalness of them, if there were any thing under them, that were capable of being understood: But that is not the greatest quarrel I have with this doctrine; for I say still, notwithstanding all the tricks and arts which have been used to palliate it, it doth obstruct the sincerity of devotion, by making the exercise of it by the preparation of our minds for the use of Sacraments to be unnecessary. For if *Grace* be effectually conferred by the force of the bare external action, which is acknowledged by them all, what need can there be of a due preparation of mind by the exercise of faith, prayer, repentance, &c. in order to the receiving the benefit of them? *Yes*, say they, *the internal disposition of the mind is necessary to remove impediments, and to make a subject capable of receiving it: as dryness in wood to make it burn:* but what do they mean by this *Internal disposition* of mind? the exercise of the

the graces and duties I mentioned? by no means: but that there be no mortal sin unconfessed; that there be no actual opposition in the *Will* to the *Sacrament*, as for instance, if a man when he is going to be baptized, resolves with himself that he will not be baptized, or while he is baptizing, that he will not believe in *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Ghost*, nor renounce the *Devil* and all his works. This indeed they say hinders the *efficacy* of *Sacraments*, but not the *bare want of devotion*; and if want of devotion doth not hinder *Grace* being received, what arguments can men use to perswade persons to it? Who will undergo so strict an examination of himself, and endeavour to raise his mind to a due preparation for the participation of *Sacraments*, if he knows before hand that he shall certainly receive *Grace* by the *Sacraments* without it? And surely they will not say, but what doth obstruct the exercise of these things, doth very much hinder devotion. If men had a mind to banish it out of the world, they could never do it under a fairer pretence, than that *Grace*, and consequently the effects of it may be obtained without it: and I do not question, but this doctrine hath been one of the great causes of the corrupt lives of those who believe it? From hence the trade of saying *Masses* hath proved so gainful, and such multitudes of them have been procured for the benefit of particular persons; this being a much easier way of procuring *Grace* and *Salvation*, than fervent prayer, constant endeavours after a Holy Life, Mortification, Watchfulness

fulneſs and other things we make neceſſary to enjoy the benefit of what Chriſt hath done and ſuffered for us?

And theſe things have been complained of, by perſons of their own communion who have had any zeal for *devotion*, and the practice of true *Goodneſs*. *Caſſander*, although he denies the doctrine of the efficacy of the *Sacraments* without the devotion of the receiver, to be the received doctrine of the *Roman Church*, yet cannot deny, *but ſuch a Phariſaical opinion* (as he calls it) *had poſſeſſed the minds of many of thoſe who did celebrate Maſſes, and were preſent at them: and that too juſt on occaſion was given to thoſe who upbraid them with that opinion; becauſe of the multitude of Maſſes which were celebrated by impure and wicked Prieſts, meerly for gain; at which thoſe who are preſent, think they depart from them with a great deal of ſanctity, although they never once reſolve to change their lives, but return from thence immediately to their former ſins.* *Monſ. Arnauld* in his Book of *Frequent Communion* (written upon that occaſion) confeſſeth, that ſome in the *Roman Church*, by their *doctrine* and inſtructions given to perſons, did deſtroy all preparations, as unneceſſary to the partaking the benefits of the *Euchariſt*; and that the worſt perſons might come without fear to it. And that the moſt required as neceſſary by them, is only the *Sacrament* of *Penance* to recover Grace by, which, he ſaith, they reduce to *bare confeſſion*; and that this by them is not made neceſſary neither by the more probable opinion, but

This proved to be the doctrine of the *Roman Church.*

Caſſand. Conſultat. art. 24.

Arnald. de freq. Commun. præfat. Sect. 2.

Part. 2. *c.* 7. *p.* 554.

only that at that time they ſhould be free from the guilt of mortal ſin. It is not to be denied, that *Monſ. Arnauld* hath proved ſufficiently the other opinion to be moſt conſonant to *Scripture* and *Fathers*, and the *rules* of a *Chriſtian life*; but when that is granted, the other opinion is yet more agreeable to the doctrine of the *Roman Church*. For although *Caſſander* produce ſome particular teſtimonies againſt it, of perſons in that *Church*; yet we muſt appeal for the ſenſe of their Church, to the decrees of the *Council* of *Trent*; which are ſo contrived, as not to condemn the groſſeſt doctrine of the *opus operatum*. For when it doth determine, *That whoſoever ſhall ſay, that the Sacraments do not confer grace* ex opere operato *ſhall be Anathema*; it cannot be interpreted, according to the ſenſe of *Caſſander* and thoſe he mentions, that the efficacy of *Sacraments* doth not depend upon the *worth of the Prieſt*: For the twelfth Canon relates to that, *Whoſoever ſhall ſay, that the Miniſter being in mortal ſin, although he uſeth all the eſſentials to a Sacrament, yet doth not celebrate a Sacrament, let him be Anathema*. Thoſe Reverend *Fathers* were not ſure ſo prodigal of their *Anathema's*, to beſtow two of them upon the ſame thing: Their meaning then in the *eighth Canon*, muſt be diſtinct from the *twelfth*; and if it be ſo, the *opus operatum* cannot have reſpect to the *worth of the Prieſt*, but the *devotion* of the *receiver*, and it is there oppoſed to the faith of the divine promiſe. This will appear more plain by the account given of it in the *Hiſtory* of that *Council*.

Council. "After, they treated of condemning, "ing those, who deny *Sacraments* do confer "grace to him that putteth not a bar, or do "not confess, that *Grace* is contained in the Sa- "craments, and conferred, not by vertue of "faith, but *ex opere operato*; but coming to "expound how it is contained, and their "causality, every one did agree, that grace is "gained by all those actions that excite de- "votion, which proceedeth not from the force "of the work it self, but from the vertue "of devotion, which is in the worker, and "these are said in the Schools to cause grace "*ex opere operantis*. There are other actions "which cause grace, not by the devotion of "him that worketh, or him that receiveth the "work, but by vertue of the work it self; such "are the Christian *Sacraments*, by which grace "is received, so that there be no bar of "mortal sin to exclude it, though there be "not any devotion: So by the work of "Baptism, grace is given to the Infant, whose "mind is not moved towards it, and to one "born a Fool, because there is no impediment "of sin. The *Sacrament* of *Chrism* doth the "like, and that of *extream Unction*, though the "sick man hath lost his memory. But he that "hath mortal sin, and doth persevere actu- "ally or habitually, cannot receive grace by "reason of the contrariety; not because the "*Sacrament* hath not vertue to produce it "*ex opere operato*, but because the receiver "is not capable, being possessed with a con- "trary quality. I dare now appeal to the

The History of the Council of Trent, l. 2. p. 237.

moſt indifferent Judge, Whether what I objected to them concerning the *efficacy* of *Sacraments*, whether the minds of the receivers of them be prepared or no, were not ſo far from being a *calumny*, that there is not ſo much as the leaſt *miſtake* in it: if the doctrine of the *Council* of *Trent* be embraced by them. And any one who ſhall conſider their number of *Sacraments*, and the admirable effects of every one of them, may very well wonder how any man among them ſhould either want *Grace*, or have any *Devotion?* For *Grace* being conferred by the *Sacraments*, at ſo many convenient ſeaſons of his life, whether he hath any devotion or no, he is ſure of *Grace*, if he doth but partake of their *Sacraments*, and need not trouble himſelf much about *devotion*, ſince his work may be done without it. Never certainly any doctrine was better contrived for the ſatisfaction and encouragement of *impenitent ſinners*, than theirs is. Our *Saviour* ſeems very churliſh and ſevere, when he calls *ſinners* to *repentance* that they may be ſaved; but they have found out a much eaſier and ſmoother paſſage, like that of a man in a Boat, that they ſleep all the while, and land ſafe at laſt. Not ſo much as the uſe of reaſon is required for the effect of that bleſſed *Sacrament* of extream *Unction*, by which like a *Ship* for a long Voyage, a perſon is pitched and calked for Eternity. Surely, it is the hardeſt thing that may be, for any one to want *Grace* among them, if they do but ſuffer the *Uſe of Sacraments* upon them; and they

are

are the gentleſt givers of it imaginable, for all they deſire of their *Penitents* for *Grace*, is only for them to lie ſtill; but if they ſhould chance to be unruly, and kick away the *Prieſts*, or their rites of *Chriſms*, I know not then what may become of them. Yet the *Church* of *Rome* hath been ſo indulgent in this caſe, that *ſuppoſing men under a* delirium, *or wholly inſenſible, if before, it be but probable they deſired it, or gave any ſigns of contrition, it ought not to be omitted; always provided, that thoſe who are mad do nothing againſt the reverence of the Sacrament*; & if they do, ſurely no man in his right wits can think they ſhall be damn'd for it. That being ſecured, their work is done; and if any ſins have remained upon them; they are taken off by vertue of this *ſacred Unction*; and being thus anointed like the *Athletæ* of old they prepared to wreſtle with all the powers of the Air, who can then faſten no hold upon them. Yet to be juſt to them, the *Roman Ritual* ſaith, *that impenitent perſons, and thoſe who dye in mortal ſin, and excommunicate, and unbaptized, are to be denied extream Unction.* A hard caſe for thoſe *who dye in mortal ſin!* for if they could but expreſs any *ſign* of *contrition*, by the motion of an Eye or a *Finger*, all were well enough? And for the *impenitent*, we are not to imagine them ſo cruel to account any ſo, but ſuch who refuſe the *Sacrament* of *Penance*. The ſum of it then is, if a man when he is like to live and therefore to ſin no longer, doth but probably expreſs ſome *ſigns* of *contrition*, and doth not refuſe the *Sacrament* of *Penance*, if time and the condition

Ritual. Roman. de Sacram. ext. unct. Part. 1. c. 65.

of the *Patient* permit the uſing it, then he is to have grace conferred on him by this laſt *Sacrament* which he is ſure to receive, although he be no more ſenſible what they are doing about him, than if he were dead already. So that upon the whole matter, I begin to wonder how any ſort of men in the *Church* of *Rome* can be afraid of falling ſo low as *Purgatory*: I had thought ſo much *Grace* as is given them by every Sacrament (where there are ſo many, and ſome of them ſo often uſed) might have ſerved to carry one to Heaven; they receive a ſtock of *Grace* in *Baptiſm*, before they could think of it, if they loſe any in Childhood, that is ſupplied again by the *Sacrament* of *Chriſm* or *Confirmation*; if they fall into actual ſins, and ſo loſe it, it is but *confeſſing* to the *Prieſt* and receiving *abſolution*, and they ſet up again with a new ſtock: and it is a hard caſe, if that be not increaſed by frequent *Maſſes*, at every one of which he receives more; and although *Prieſts* want the comfortable Grace that is to be received by the *Sacrament* of *Matrimony*, yet they may eaſily make it up by the number of *Maſſes*: and to make all ſure at laſt, the extream *Unction* very ſweetly conveys *Grace* into them, whether they be ſenſible or not. But all this while, what becomes of *Purgatory?* That is like to be left very deſolate; if the intereſt of that opinion were not greater, than the evidence is for the *Sacraments* conferring grace *ex opere operato*. Let them ſeek to reconcile them, if they can; it is ſufficient for our purpoſe, that both of them tend

to

to destroy the sincerity of devotion, and the necessity of a good life.

§ 8. 3. I said the sincerity of devotion is much obstructed by discouraging the *reading* of the *Scriptures*, which is our most certain rule of faith and life. To this he answers two ways: 1. *That their Churches prudential dispensing the reading the Scriptures to persons whom she judges fit and disposed for it, and not to such whom she judges in a condition to receive or do harm by it, is no discouraging the reading of them; any more than a Father may be said to discourage his Child, because he will not put a Knife or a Sword into his hands, when he foresees he will do mischief with it to himself or others; and the Scriptures*, he saith, *are no other, in the hands of one who doth not submit his judgement, in the interpretation of it, to that of the Church; the doing of which he makes the character of a meek and humble soul, and the contrary of an arrogant and presumptuous spirit.* 2. *That the ill consequences of permitting the promiscuous reading of Scripture were complained of by* Henry *the eighth, who was the first that gave way to it; and if his judgement ought not to be followed in after times, let the dire effects of so many Sects and Fanaticisms as have risen in* England *from the reading of it, bear witness. For all Heresies arise, saith S.* Austin, *from misunderstanding the Scriptures; and therefore the Scripture being left, as among Protestants, to the private interpretation of every fanciful spirit, cannot be a most certain rule of faith and life.* In which Answer are three things to be discussed: Of their discouraging the reading the Scriptures.

1. Whether that prudential dispensing the *Scriptures*, as he calls it, be any hindrance to devotion or no? 2. Whether the reading of the *Scriptures* be the cause of the numbers of *Sects* and *Fanaticisms* which have been in *England*? 3. Whether our opinion concerning the reading and interpreting *Scripture*, doth hinder it from being a most certain rule of faith and life?

1. Whether that prudential dispensing the *Scriptures* used in the *Church* of *Rome*, doth hinder *devotion* or no? By this *prudential dispensing* I suppose he means, the allowing no persons to read the *Scriptures* in their own tongue, without licence under the hand of the *Bishop* or *Inquisitor*, by the advice of the Priest or Confessor, concerning the persons fitness for it; and whosoever presumes to do otherwise, is to be denied *Absolution*. For this is the express Command, in the fourth Rule of the *Index* published by order of the *Council of Trent*, and set forth by the authority of *Pius* the fourth, and since by *Clement* the eighth, and now lately inlarged by *Alexander* the seventh. And whether this tends to the promoting or discouraging the sincerity of devotion will appear, by considering these things.

Index librorum prohibitorum Alexandri 7. Romæ, A.D. 1665.

1. That it is agreed on both sides, that the *Scriptures* do contain in them the unquestionable Will of that *God* whom we are bound to serve. And it being the end of *devotion* (as it ought to be of our lives) to serve him; what is there, the mind of any one who sincerely desires to do it, can be more inquisitive after,

or

or desirous to be satisfied in, than the rules *God* himself hath given for his own service? Because it is so easie a matter for men to mistake in the wayes they choose to serve him in; I see the world divided scarce more about any thing than this. Some think, *God* ought to be worshipped by offering up Sacrifices to him of those things we receive from his bounty: Others, that we ought to offer up none to him now, but our selves in a holy life and actions. Some, that *God* is pleased by abstaining from flesh or any living creature; and others, that he is much better pleased with eating *Fish* than *Flesh*, and that a full meal of one is at some times mortification and fasting; and eating temperately of the other, is luxury and irreligion. Some think, no sight more pleasing to *God*, than to see men lash and whip themselves for their sins, till the blood comes; others that he is as well pleased at least, with hearty repentance, and sincere obedience without this. Some, that frequent crossing themselves, going in Pilgrimage to the *Images* of *Saints*, baptizing Bells, being sprinckled with holy water, and buried in a *Monks* habit, are great acts of devotion; and others, that they are superstitious fooleries. Some think, that unless they make confession of their sins to a *Priest*, they cannot be pardoned; others, that sincere confession to God, is sufficient, and the other never necessary to the pardon of sin, though it may be sometimes useful to the ease of the sinner. Some, that they honour *God* by setting up Images of him, and worshipping them for his sake;

ſake; by addreſſing themſelves to Saints and Angels to be Interceſſors with him; and others, that they cannot diſhonour *God* more, than by theſe things. Some, that they may pray for what they do not underſtand, as well as what they do; others, that ſince men expect to be anſwered in their prayers, they ought to underſtand what they ſay in them. Since theſe and other diſputes are in the world, not barely between *Chriſtians* and thoſe of other *Religions*, but among *Chriſtians* themſelves, what courſe ſhould a perſon take, who deſires to be ſatisfied? For he finds the ſeveral parties divided about them. Can any man imagine a better way, if it could be hoped for, than that *God* himſelf ſhould interpoſe, and declare his own mind according to what way they ought to ſerve him? And this is acknowledged by all *Chriſtians* to be done already, in the *Scriptures*; and after all this, muſt not all perſons concerned, be allowed to enquire into that which is owned to be the will of God? Or do they think, that ordinary people, that underſtand not *Latin* or *Greek*, ought not to be concerned what becomes of their ſouls? If they be, and do in good earneſt deſire to know how to pleaſe *God*, and to ſerve him; what directions will they give them? If they tell them, *they muſt do as they are bidden*; true, ſay they, if we were to worſhip you for *Gods*, we would do as you bid us, for we think it fitting to ſerve *God* in his own way. But we would know, whether that *God* whom we ſerve, hath given us any

rules

rules for his worſhip or no? *Yes*, ſay the Prieſts of the *Roman Church*, *he hath done ſo, but it is not fit for you to ſee them.* To what end, ſay the people then, were they given, if they may not be ſeen? How ſhall we know, whether we keep them or no; or will you take upon you the guilt of our ſins in diſobeying his Will, ſince you will not let us know what it is? This ſeems to be a very juſt and reaſonable demand, and I fear it will one day fall heavy upon thoſe, who conceal that, which they confeſs to be the *Will* of *God*, from the knowledge of the people. And it hath been ingenuouſly acknowledged by ſome in the *Roman Church*, that the people would never be kept to that way of *devotion* they are in there, if they were ſuffered to read the *Scriptures*; but the more ſhame, the mean time, for thoſe who impoſe ſuch things upon them, under a pretence of devotion, which are ſo repugnant to the Will of God. But the ſame reaſon which hath made them leave out the *ſecond Commandment* in their offices of devotion, hath brought them to ſo ſevere a prohibition of reading the *Scriptures* in a known language, but where themſelves are already ſo ſecure of the perſons that they dare to give way to it: and that is, leſt their conſciences ſhould ſtart and boggle at the breaking a command of *God*, when they pretended to ſerve him.

§. 9.

The arguments against reading the Scriptures, would have held against the publishing them in a language known to the People.

§. 9. 2. That no objection can be now made against the peoples reading the *Scriptures*, but would have held against the publishing them in a language to be understood by the people. For were the people less ignorant and heady, less presumptuous and opinionative then, than they are now? Was not there the same danger of mistaking their sense at that time? Was not the people of *Israel* as refractory and disobedient, as any have been since? Were they not as apt to quarrel with divine *Laws*, and the authority *God* had set up among them? Did not they fall into Sects and divers opinions, by misunderstanding the *Law*? yet were these reasons then thought sufficient for *God* not to make known his *Law* to all the people; but to commit it only to *Aaron* and the *Priests*, for them prudentially to dispense it to them? No; so far from it, that strict care was taken to make the people understand it; particular commands given for this very end; and the Law on purpose declared to be calie and *intelligible*, that they might not make its obscurity a pretence for their Ignorance. Was not this *Law* given them, as a *rule* to direct themselves by? Were not all sent to this to learn to govern their actions? *Wherewithall shall a young man cleanse his wayes, by taking heed thereto according to thy word?* Is not this *Law* said to *convert the soul, and to make wise the simple?* and was that done by *not understanding* it? Was it not the delight, exercise, and continual Meditation of those who were truly devout among them? But how comes our case to

Psal 119. 9.

Psal. 19. 7.

be

be ſo much worſe under *Chriſtianity*? Is the *Law* of *Chriſt* ſo much more difficult and obſcure, than the *Law* of *Moſes*? Is not his *Sermon* on the *Mount*, wherein he delivers the rules of a *Chriſtian Life*, as plain as any Chapter in *Leviticus*? What doth the *Goſpel* teach men, but to be and to do good, to love all men, and to love *God* above all, to believe in Chriſt and to obey his commands, to repent of ſins paſt and to live no longer in them; and in ſhort, ſo to live in this world, as they hope to live with *God* in happineſs hereafter? And are theſe things ſo hard to be underſtood, that the people ought not to be made acquainted with them, in their own language? Or is there any danger, they ſhould know them too well? Was ever the *Law* of *Moſes* more perverted by falſe interpretations, than in our *Saviours* time *by* the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*? Why doth not he then take ſome other care for his own *Law* to prevent this for the future, if that had been judged by him the proper way of cure? But thereby we ſee the miſtakes of the people are owing to their Teachers, and there can be no means to prevent errours in the people, but by ſtopping them at the fountain heads, from whence they run down among them. For the common people might have had a better notion of *Religion*, if their minds had not been corrupted by the traditions and *Gloſſes* of the *Phariſees*. Therefore methinks, they have not gone the wiſeſt way to work in the *Church* of *Rome*; inſtead of this *prudential diſpenſing the Scriptures*, their only way had been to have deſtroyed

deſtroyed them, as *Diocleſian*, their predeceſſour in this kind of *prudence*, once deſigned. For let them aſſure themſelves, they who underſtand *Greek* and *Latin* are the perſons they have ten times more cauſe to fear, than the common people. And conſidering the advantage they once had by the horrible *Ignorance* of *Prieſts* and people, it muſt be imputed only to the watchful eye of Divine Providence, that the *Scriptures* (being of ſo little uſe in the *Roman Church*) have been preſerved entire to our dayes. There had been no ſuch means in the world to have prevented a *Reformation*, as this; for they are not out, when they take the *Scripture* ſo much for their enemy, as appears by the force and reſtraint they put upon it, and the fear and jealouſie they are in about it continually. If it had not been for this, would any one have compared the *Scriptures*, in the hands of the common people as my Adverſary doth, *to a Sword in a mad mans hand?* Is it of ſo deſtructive a Nature, and framed for no other uſe than a ſword is? which nothing but diſcretion keeps a man from doing miſchief by; and all the way a man hath (though never ſo meek and humble) to defend himſelf by it, is by deſtroying his enemy with it, if he continues his aſſault. Theſe expreſſions do not argue any kindneſs to the *Scripture*, nor an apprehenſion of any great good that comes to the world by it; but that really men might have been more at eaſe and fewer differences in Religion had happened, if all the Copies of the *Bible* had been loſt, aſſoon as the *Pope* had placed himſelf in his infallible *Chair*.

This

This design was once attempted, as I shall shew afterwards, but failed of success: and I know not how far the principles of this *prudence* may carry them, if ever such a season should fall into their hands again; having found so much trouble to them from the *Scriptures* and so little benefit by them, their *Church* being once owned as *infallible*. For I would fain know, whether the *Scripture* hath not done more mischief, according to them, in the hands of the *Reformers*, than it can be supposed to do in the hands of the *common people*. If it must be *a sword in a mad mans hand*, whether the more strength and cunning such a one hath, he be not capable of doing so much the more mischief by it? And if it were possible to get it out of such a mans hands, whether it were not the highest *prudence*, and care of the publick safety to do it? It can be then nothing but the impossibility of the thing, which makes them suffer the *Scripture* to be in the hands of any who are capable of doing mischief by it; and the more mischief they may do, the more desirable and *prudential* it is to take it from them. But all men see none are so capable of doing mischief thereby, as men of the greatest wit and learning, and that have the fairest appearance of piety to the world: the consequence then of this doctrine is, if pursued to the true design of it, that the *Scripture* should be kept if possible out of the hands of the most subtle, learned and pious men above all others, if they be not true to the interests of the *Roman Church*? It is but a meer shew to pretend only to keep the people in order,

order, (for when are they otherwiſe, but when cunning men have the managing of them?) the true meaning of this principle is, that it will never be well with the World till the Books of *Scripture* are all burnt, which are abroad; and that only one *Original* be preſerved in the *Vatican* to juſtifie the *Popes* title to *Infallibility*, and that (as the *Sybilline Oracles* of old,) never to be conſulted but in caſes of great extremity; and that under the inſpection of ſome very truſty officers; nor to be interpreted but by the *Pope* himſelf. If I were of the Church of *Rome*, and owned the principles of it, I muſt needs have condemned the great men of it in former times, for want of *Prudence* in this matter: That would have ſerved their turn much better than forging ſo many *decretal Epiſtles*, falſifying ſo many *teſtimonies*, perverting ſo many *Texts* of *Scripture* to maintain the dignity of the *Papal Chair*. There was only one ſmall circumſtance wanting, (their good will we have no cauſe to queſtion) and that was the poſſibility of it; for although the *Roman Church* called it ſelf *Catholick*, they were wiſe enough to know, there were many conſiderable *Churches* in the world beſides theirs, where the *Scriptures* were preſerved, and from whence Copies might be procured by perſons who would be ſo much the more inquiſitive, the more they were forbidden to get them. Therefore they pitched upon an eaſier way, and finding the people under a very competent degree of *Ignorance*, they indulged them and ſoothed them

up

up in it, and told them they could never miss the way to Heaven, though never so narrow, in the dark. Their only danger was too much light, for then probably they might be in a great dispute, whether the *broad way* was not the true; for there they saw most of their *Friends* and *Leaders*. And while they kept the people in this profound Ignorance and superstition, they jogged on in their opinion, as securely to Heaven, as *Ignatius Loyola*'s Mule did to *Mount-serrat*, when he laid his Bridle on his neck, to see whether he would take the way to pursue the *Moor*, which was the more beaten track, or the more craggy and untrodden way to that place of *devotion*; and by a mighty providence, (and I suppose a little help of the Rider) the Beast took the more narrow way. But when persons began to be awakened by learning, and thereby grew inquisitive into all matters, and so by degrees in those of Religion; they then espied their error, in letting such a Book lye abroad in so many hands, from whence so many irresistible arguments were drawn against the Doctrine and practices of the *Roman Church*. This I assure my self, is the true ground of the quarrels against the Reading of the *Scriptures*; but that being now irremediable, they betake themselves to smaller arts, and endeavour to hinder any one particular person, whom they have the least suspicion of, from meddling with a Book so dangerous to their *Church* and *Religion*.

Orlandin. hist. Societ. Jesu l. 1. *n.* 17. *Maffeius vit. Ignat. l.* 1. *c.* 3.

The practice of the Roman Church herein directly contrary to that of the Primitive Church.

§. 10. For if this were not it, what makes them to be more jealous of the *use* of the *Scriptures*, than ever the Christians were in former Ages? Was there not much more danger of misunderstanding the Doctrine of the Gospel at first, than ever after? Nay were there not very many who were false *Apostles*, and great and dangerous Hereticks, presumptuous and arrogant, if ever any were? But did *Christ*, or his *Apostles*, for all this, think it unfit to communicate the doctrine of the *Gospel* to the people; or were the Books containing it written in Languages not to be understood by them? no, they chose the most popular Languages of that time, most largely spread and generally understood. The *Apostles* never told their Disciples, of the danger of reading the Divine Writings that were among them, when they were first spread abroad; and never so proper a season to give them caution, as then. But instead of
2 Pet. 1. 19. that, they advise them *to take heed to the sure word of Prophecy*, and tell them that they did
Rom. 15. 4. 2 Tim. 3. 15, 16. well therein, that *the Scriptures were written for their instruction and comfort*, that *being divinely inspired they were able to make them wise unto salvation.* What, did the *Apostles* never imagine all this while, the ill use that might be made of them by men of perverse minds? yes, they knew it as well as any, and did foretell *Schismes* and *Heresies* that should be in the *Church*, and saw them in their own dayes; and yet, poor men, wanted that *exquisite prudence of the Roman Church*, to prevent them, by so happy an expedient, as when they

they had written *Epiſtles* to ſeveral *Churches* to forbid the promiſcuous reading of them. But it may be, it was the awe of the *Apoſtles* and their infallible *Spirit* in interpreting *Scripture*, made this prohibition not ſo neceſſary in their own time; did the *Church* then find it neceſſary to reſtrain the people, after their Deceaſe? We have an occaſion ſoon after given, wherein to ſee the opinion of the *Church* at that time; the *Church* of *Corinth* fell into a grievous Schiſme and oppoſition, to their ſpiritual Governours: upon this *Clemens* writes his Epiſtle to them; wherein he is ſo far from forbidding the uſe of *Scripture* to them to preſerve unity, that he bidds them *look diligently into the Scriptures, which are the true Oracles of the Holy Ghoſt*: and afterwards, *take St.* Pauls *Epiſtle into your hands, and conſider what he ſaith; and he commends them very much for being ſkilled in the Scriptures: Beloved*, ſaith he, *ye have known, and very well known, the holy Scriptures; and ye have throughly looked into the Oracles of God, therefore call them to mind.* Which language is as far different from that of the *Roman Church*, as the Church of that *Age* is from theirs. Nay the counterfeit *Clemens* (whom they can make uſe of, upon other occaſions) is as expreſs in this matter, as the true. For he perſwades private Chriſtians *to continual meditation in the Scriptures*, which he calls the *Oracles of Chriſt*; *and that this is the beſt employment of their retirements.* But we need not uſe his teſtimony in this matter, nor the old Edition of *Ignatius*, wherein Parents are bid *to inſtruct their Children*

Clement. Epiſtol. ad Corinth. p. 58. P. 61. P. 68.

Conſtit. Clement. l. 1. *c.* 4.

Ignat. ep ad Philadelph. Polycarp. Ep. ad Philip. p. 16. ed uſſ.

in the Holy Scriptures; nor that ſaying of *Polycarp* to the *Philippians* out of the old *Latin Edition*, *I am confident you are well ſtudied in the Scriptures*; for in the *Greek* yet preſerved, he exhorts them *to the reading of St.* Pauls *Epiſtles, that they might be built up in the faith.* So little did theſe holy men dream of ſuch a *prudent diſpenſing the Scriptures* among them, for fear of miſchief they might do themſelves or others by them. *Clemens Alexandrinus* mentions *the reading the Scriptures among Chriſtians before their Meales, and Pſalmes and Hymns at them*, and *Tertullian* mentions the ſame cuſtome. *Origen*, in the *Greek Commentaries*, lately publiſhed, perſwades Chriſtians *by all means, by attending to Reading, Prayer, Teaching, Meditation therein day and night, to lay up in their hearts not only the new Oracles of the Goſpel, Apoſtles and Apocalypſe, but the old ones too of the Law and the Prophets.* And elſewhere tells his hearers, *they ought not to be diſcouraged if they met with difficulties in reading the Scriptures: for there was great benefit to be had by them.* But leſt it ſhould be thought, he ſpeaks here only of publick reading the *Scriptures*, in his Homilies on *Leviticus* he ſpeaks plainly, *that he would not only have them hear the Word of God in publick, but to be exerciſed and meditate therein in their houſes night and day*; *For Chriſt is every where preſent, and therefore they are commanded in the Law, to meditate therein upon their journeys, and when they ſit in their houſes, and when they lye down and riſe up.* But had not the *Church* yet experience enough

Clem Alexandr. Strom. 7. p. 728. Tertul. de anim. c. 9. Orig. Comment. in Matthæum. p. 210.

Comment. in Joſ p. 27.

Homil. in Levit. 9.

of

of the mischief of permitting the *Scriptures* to the people? Were there ever greater and more notorious heresies than in those first ages of the *Church*, and those arising from perverting the words and design of the *Scriptures*? But did the *Church* yet afterwards grow wiser, in the sense of the *Roman Church*? In the time of the four *General Councils* they had tryal enough of the mischief of *Heresies*, but did the *Fathers* of the *Church* forbid the reading the *Scriptures*, on that account? No, but instead of that, they commend the Scriptures to all, *as the best remedy for all passions of the mind*; so St. *Basil*, and St. *Hierome* call it; and this latter commends nothing more to the Women he instructed in devotion, *than constant reading the Scriptures*; and withal they say *that infinite evils do arise from ignorance of the Scriptures*; *from hence most part of Heresies have come, from hence a negligent and careless life, and unfruitful labours.* Nay so frequent, so earnest and vehement is St. *Chrysostome* in this matter of recommending the reading of *Scriptures*, that those of the *Roman Church* have no other way to answer him, but by saying *he speaks hyperbolically*; which in plain *English* is, he speaks too much of it. But how far different were the opinions of the wise men of the *Church* in those times, from what those have thought who understood the *interest* of the *Roman Church* best? We may see what the opinion of the latter is, by the counsel given to *Julius* 3. by the *Bishops* met at *Bononia* for that end, to give the best advice they could for

Basil. in Psal. 1. *Hieron. præfat. com. in ep. ad Ephes.*

S. Chrys. præfat. in Epist. ad Rom.

Consil. de stabiliendâ Rom. sede. p. 6.

reſtoring the dignity of the *Roman See*; *that which was the greateſt and weightieſt of all*, they ſaid, *they reſerved to the laſt*; *which was, that by all means as little of the Goſpel as might be eſpecially in the vulgar tongue, be read in the Cities under his juriſdiction*; *and that little which was in the Maſs ought to be ſufficient*; *neither ſhould it be permitted to any mortal to read more. For as long as men were contented with that little, all things went well with them, but quite otherwiſe ſince more was commonly read. For this, in ſhort, is that Book*, ſay they, *which above all others hath raiſed thoſe Tempeſts and Whirlwinds, which we are almoſt carryed away with: And in truth, if any one diligently conſiders it, and compares it with what is done in our Churches, will find them very contrary to each other*; *and our very doctrine not only to be different from it, but repugnant to it.* A very fair and ingenuous confeſſion! and if ſelf-condemned perſons be Hereticks, there can be none greater than thoſe of the *Roman Church*; eſpecially the *prudential men* in it, ſuch as theſe certainly were, whom the *Pope* ſingled out to give advice in theſe matters. But how different is the wiſdom of the *Children of this world* from that of the *Children of Light!* We have already ſeen what other kind of judgement the ancient Fathers had of the uſefulneſs of *Scriptures* to the people, than they have in the *Roman Church*: but we need not more to prove it, ſince it is acknowledged by thoſe who are againſt the reading the Scriptures by the people, that it was otherwiſe in the *Primitive Church*; ſo

Alphonſus

Alphonſus à Caſtro and *Sixtus Senenſis* confeſs. *Eſpencæus* quotes many plain places from St. *Auſtin*, and St. *Chryſoſtom* to prove, that the people ought to be very diligent in reading the *Scriptures* in their own houſes, and that nothing ſhould excuſe them from it: and confeſſeth that St. *Pauls* precept, Col. 3. *let the word of God dwell richly in you* was intended for the *people*; and that they ought to have it among them, not only ſufficiently, but abundantly. The ſum of this argument is, that the reaſons now urged againſt the peoples Reading the *Scriptures* would have held againſt the publiſhing of them in a language to be underſtood by the people; that they ſaw the ſame inconveniencies which are objected now, and yet commended the reading the *Scriptures* to all; that in all the primitive *Church*, the practice was not only retained, but vehemently urged, after all the Hereſies which had riſen in the *Church* in their time; and therefore for the *Church* of *Rome* to account it *wiſdom* to keep the people from it, is to charge not only the *Fathers* of the *Church* with folly, but the *Apoſtles*, and our *Saviour*, and *God* himſelf.

Alphonſ. à Caſtro adverſ. hæreſ. l. 1. c. 13. Sixti Senenſ. Bibliotheh. l. 6. Annot. 152. Eſpencæus in Tit. c. 2. p. 517.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Fanaticism of the Roman *Church.*

The unreasonableness of objecting Sects and Fanaticisms to us, as the effects of reading the Scriptures. Fanaticism countenanced in the Roman *Church, but condemned by ours. Private revelations made among them the grounds of believing some points of doctrine; proved from their own Authors. Of the Revelations pleaded for the immaculate Conception. The Revelations of S.* Brigitt *and S.* Catharin *directly contrary in this point, yet both owned in the Church of* Rome. *The large approbations of S.* Brigitts, *by Popes and Councils; and both their revelations acknowledged to be divine, in the lessons read upon their dayes. S.* Catharines *wonderful faculty of smelling souls, a gift peculiar to her and* Philip Nerius. *The vain attempts of reconciling those Revelations. The great number of female Revelations approved in the* Roman *Church. Purgatory, Transubstantiation, Auricular Confession proved by Visions and Revelations. Festivals appointed upon the credit of Revelations: the Feast of* Corpus Christi *on the Revelation made to* Juliana, *the Story of it related from their own Writers: No such things can be objected to our Church. Revelations still owned by*

by them; proved from the Fanatick Revelations of Mother Juliana *very lately published by Mr.* Cressy: *Some instances of the blasphemous Non-sense contained in them. The Monastick Orders founded in Enthusiasm. An account of the great Fanaticism of S.* Benedict, *and S.* Romoaldus: *their hatred of Humane Learning, and strange Visions and Revelations. The Carthusian Order founded upon a Vision. The Carmelites Vision of their habit. The Franciscan and Dominican Orders founded on Fanaticism, and seen in a Vision of* Innocent *the third to be the great supporters of the* Roman *Church. The* Quakerism *of S.* Francis *described from their best Authors. His Ignorance, Extasies and Fanatick Preaching. The Vision of* Dominicus. *The blasphemous Enthusiasm of the Mendicant Fryers. The History of it related at large. Of the* Evangelium æternum, *and the blasphemies contained in it. The Author of it supposed to be the General of the Franciscan Order, however owned by the Fryers, and read and preached at* Paris. *The opposition to it by the University: but favoured by the* Popes. Gul. S. Armour *writing against it, his Book publickly burnt, by order of the* Court *of* Rome. *The* Popes *horrible partiality to the Fryers. The Fanaticism of the Franciscans afterwards. Of the followers of* Petrus Johannis de Oliva. *The Spiritual State began (say they) from S.* Francis. *The story of his wounds, and* Maria Visitationis *paralell'd. The canting language used by the spiritual Brethren, called* Beguini,

Beguini, Fraticelli, *and* Begardi. *Of their doctrines about Poverty, Swearing Perfection, the Carnal Church and Inſpiration: by all which, they appear to be a Sect of* Quakers, *after the Order of S.* Francis. *Of the Schiſm made by them. The large ſpreading, and long continuance of them. Of the* Apoſtolici *and* Dulciniſtæ. *Of their numerous Conventicles. Their high opinion of themſelves. Their zeal againſt the Clergy, and Tythes; their doctrine of Chriſti in Liberty. Of the* Alumbrado's *in* Spain: *their diſobedience to Biſhops; obſtinate adhering to their own fancies, calling them Inſpirations; their being above Ordinances.* Ignatius Loyola *ſuſpected to be one of the* Illuminati, *proved from* Melchior Canus. *The Jeſuits Order founded in Fanaticiſm; a particular account of the Romantick Enthuſiaſm of* Ignatius, *from the Writers of his own Order. Whereby it is proved, that he was the greateſt pretender to Enthuſiaſm, ſince the days of* Mahomet *and S.* Francis. Ignatius *gave no reſpect to men by words, or putting off his Hat; his great Ignorance and Preaching in the Streets: his glorying in his ſufferings for it; his pretence to Mortification; the ways he uſed to get diſciples. Their way of reſolution of difficulties by ſeeking God; their itenerant preaching in the Cities of* Italy. *The Sect of* Quakers *a new Order of Diſciples of* Ignatius, *only wanting Confirmation from the Pope, which* Ignatius *obtained. Of the Fanatick way of devotion in the* Roman *Church. Of Superſtitions and*

En-

Enthusiastical Fanaticisms among them. Of their mystical Divinity. Mr. Cressy's *canting in his Preface to* Sancta Sophia. *Of the the Deiform fund of the soul; a supereſſential life, and the way to it. Of contemplating with the will. Of passive Unions. The method of Self-annihilation. Of the Union of nothing with nothing. Of the feeling of not-being. The miſchief of an unintelligible way of devotion. The utmoſt effects of this way is groſs Enthuſiaſm. Mr.* Cressy's *Vindication of it examined. The laſt ſort of Fanaticiſm among them, reſiſting authority under pretence of Religion. Their principles and practices compared with the Fanaticks. How far they are diſowned at preſent by them. Of the Vindication of the* Iriſh Remonſtrance. *The Court of* Rome *hath always favoured that party, which is moſt deſtructive to Civil Government, proved by particular and late Inſtances.*

§ 1. 2. WE come to conſider, Whether the reading the *Scriptures* be the cauſe of all the *Sects* and *Fanaticiſms* which have been in *England?* He might much better have charged the *Philoſophers*, eſpecially *Ariſtotle*, with all the diſputes in the world; for they not only by their writings have occaſioned many, but have taught men the pernicious uſe of reaſoning, without which, the world might be as quiet as a *Flock* of *Sheep*. If they could but perſwade men to lay aſide that miſchievous faculty, I dare undertake for them, that let the people have the *Bible* never

The unreaſonableneſs of objecting Sects and Fanaticiſm to us, as the effect of reading the Scriptures.

ſo

ſo much among them, they ſhall never hurt the *Church* of *Rome*. Do they not tell us, that the words of *Scripture* are plain for *Tranſubſtantiation* (*This is my Body.*) Why do not then the people as readily believe that, as any other propoſition? By which we ſee, it is not meerly reading, but a more dangerous thing, called *conſidering* or *reaſoning*, which makes them embrace ſome things as they lie in words, and interpret others according to the cleareſt evidence, which the nature of the thing, the comparing with other places, and the common ſenſe of mankind will give. *But why are we not all of a mind?* I would fain know the time when men were ſo. This variety of *Sects* was objected againſt the *Philoſophers*, and thought no Argument then; it was objected againſt the *primitive Chriſtians*, and thought of no force then; why muſt it ſignifie more in *England*, than ever it did in any other age or place? But ſay they, *It was otherwiſe in* England, *before the Scriptures came to be read by all; it was, and is, otherwiſe in all Churches where they are not read: therefore theſe Sects and Fanaticiſms are the dire effects of the promiſcuous reading the Scriptures.* This is the common and popular Argument. *All things were well with us when we offered up Cakes to the Queen of Heaven; when all joyned in the communion of the* Roman *Church, then there were no Fanaticiſms, nor New Lights, no Sects, as there are now in* England: *therefore why ſhould any one make any doubt, but he ought to return to the Church of* Rome? This neceſſarily leads me into the

the examination of these two things. 1. Whether there be no danger of *Fanaticism* in the *Roman Church?* 2. Whether the *Unity* of *that Church* be so admirable to tempt all persons, who prize the *Churches Unity*, to return to it?

Fanaticism countenanced in the Roman Church.

§. 2. Concerning the danger of *Fanaticism* in the *Roman Church.* By *Fanaticism* we understand, either an *Enthusiastick way of Religion*; or *resisting authority*, *under a pretence of Religion.* In either sense it shall appear, that the *Church* of *Rome* is so far from being cleared from it, that it hath given great encouragement to it.

1. As to an *Enthusiastick* way of *Religion*: I shall now prove, that there have not been greater *Enthusiasts* among us in *England*, than have been in the *Roman Church*; all the difference is, they have been some always, others for a time, allowed, and countenanced, and encouraged by those of the *Church* of *Rome*; but among us they have been decryed and opposed, by all the members of the *Church* of *England.* I shall not insist upon their resolution of faith, and the infallibility of their *Church*, which must be carried to *Enthusiasm* at last; but I shall prove it by plain *Revelations*, which have been made the grounds among them of believing some doctrines in dispute, and the reasons of setting up a more *perfect way of life*, which in the highest strain of their *Devotion*, is meer *Enthusiasm.*

1. Re-

Private Revelations pleaded for matters of doctrine.

1. *Revelations* have been pleaded by them in matters of doctrine; ſuch I mean which depend upon immediate impulſes and inſpirations, ſince the *Canon of Scripture* and *Apoſtolical Traditions*. Of this we have a remarkable inſtance, in a late Controverſie managed with great heat and intereſt on both ſides, *viz.* of the *immaculate conceptions* of the *Virgin Mary*: about the ending of which, a ſolemn *Embaſſy* was ſent from the *Kings* of *Spain*, *Philip* the third, and *Philip* the fourth, to the *Popes*, *Paul* the fifth, and *Gregory* the thirteenth; and an account is given of it by one, concerned himſelf in the management of the Theological part of it, *which*, he ſaith, *is therefore publiſhed, that the world may underſtand upon what grounds the doctrines of faith are eſtabliſhed among them.* One of the chief whereof inſiſted upon was, *ſome private revelations, made to ſome Saints, about the immaculate conception, which being once received in the Church, adds no ſmall ſtrength*, he ſaith, *to any doctrine, and gives a ſolid foundation for a definition: i. e.* that the matter may be defined to be of faith, and neceſſary to be believed by all Chriſtians. Upon this he reckons up ſeveral *Revelations*, publickly received in the *Church*; one, mentioned by *Anſelm*, being *a divine apparition to an Abbot in a ſtorm* (a fit time for apparitions) *whereby he was admoniſhed to keep the Feaſt of the Conception of the bleſſed Virgin*; upon which, as *Baronius* obſerves, *that Feaſt was firſt kept in* England. Which Revelation, *Wadding* tells us, *is publickly recited in the office for the day; and was not only extant in ſeveral*

Lucas Waddingus Legation. de concept. Virg. Mariæ. præfat. Sect. 3. Tract. 11. Sect. 1 & 3. Baron. not. in Martyrolog. Rom. 8 Decemb.

several Breviaries of England, France, Spain *and* Italy; *but he had divers himself authorized by the Pope, wherein it was recommended as true and piously to be believed; and accordingly hath been publickly sung and used in the Church about an hundred years. And what,* saith he, *is the consequence of disbelieving this, but to say in effect, that the Pope and the* Roman *Church are easily cheated and abused by Impostures, and Forgers of false Revelations to institute new Festival Solemnities upon the credit of them?* Another Revelation was made to *Norbertus*, the Founder of the Order of the *Præmonstratenses*; in which, *the Virgin* Mary *appeared, and commended her Veneration to him, and gave him a white garment, in token of her Original Innocency*; which Revelation is believed by all of that Order, and taken as the reason of their habit. Besides these, *there are several other Revelations to S.* Gertrude; *and others to the same purpose reckoned up by several Catholick Authors, which no man ought to reject, unless he intends to be as great a Heretick* (or therein as wise a man) *as* Erasmus *was. Nay, these Revelations were so frequent,* he saith, *that there hath been no age since the tenth Century, wherein there hath not been some made to devout men or women, about this matter.* But above all these, most remarkable were those to S. *Brigit*; *who had not one or two, but many to this purpose: and the latest were of* Joanna a Cruce, *which,* it seems, *were at first eagerly opposed, but at last came out with the approbation of two Cardinals, and several Bishops of the Inquisition in* Spain. But now who could imagine a thing

thing ſo often revealed, ſo publickly allowed, ſo many times atteſted from Heaven, ſhould not be generally received? but the miſchief of it was, the contrary doctrine had Revelations for it too. For *Antoninus* and *Cajetan* ſay, S. *Catharine* of *Siena* had it revealed to her, that ſhe was conceived with Original ſin. What is to be done now? Here we have Saint againſt Saint, Revelation againſt Revelation, S. *Catharine* againſt S. *Brigit* and all the reſt of them. Here to ſpeak truth, they are ſomewhat hard put to it; for they grant *God* cannot contradict himſelf, and therefore one of theſe muſt be falſe, but which of them is all the queſtion. Here they examine, which of theſe doctrines is moſt conſonant to *Scripture* and *Tradition*, which is moſt for the benefit of the *Church*, which were perſons of the greater *Sanctity*, and whoſe *Revelations* were the moſt approved. For S. *Brigits* they plead ſtoutly, that when they were delivered by her to her Confeſſors, they were ſtrictly examined and after them by the *Biſhops* and *Divines* of *Sweden*, and approved as *Divine Revelations*; from them they were ſent as ſuch to the *Council of Baſil*; from thence they were examined over again at *Naples*, and there allowed, and preached in the preſence, and by command, of the *Queen* and *Archbiſhop*, before all the people of the City; again examined at *Rome* by *Prelates* and *Cardinals*, *A. D.* 1377. by the Popes appointment, and there approved: and *A.D.* 1379. they are declared by thoſe to whom *Urban* the ſixth committed the new examination

nation of them, to be authentick, and to have come from the Spirit of God: and ſo, much is declared by *Boniface* the ninth, in the Bull of her Canonization; and *at laſt approved*, ſaith *Wadding*, *at the General Council of* Baſil. What could be expected leſs after this; than that they ſhould have been received as *Canonical Scriptures*, they having never taken ſo much pains in examining and approving any controverted Books of the Bible, as they had done about theſe Revelations? And no man knows how far their authority might have prevailed, if the whole Sect of *Dominicans* had not been engaged in the oppoſite opinion. For nothing elſe, that I can find, hath given any diſcredit to her *Revelations* but this; which makes *Cajetan* call them *old Wives dreams*, as *Wadding* confeſſeth. But it falls out very conveniently, that S. *Catharines* Revelation was juſt in the *Dominican* way, in which ſhe had been educated; and for all that I can ſee, wants little of the reputation of S. *Brigit*. For they were both very wonderful perſons, and had more familiar Revelations, than any of the Prophets we read of. S. *Brigit* in her Childhood (if we believe the account given of her, in the Bull of Canonization by *Bonifacius*, and her life by *Vaſtavius*) had Viſions as frequently as other Children have *Babies*, and was as well pleaſed with them; the *Virgin Mary* was once *her Widwife*, as the *Pope* very gravely tells us; but her Revelations (after *Chriſt* took her for his Spouſe) have filled a great Volume. Wherein a perſon that hath leiſure enough, may ſee

Wadd'ng. l. c. Sect. 24. p 357.

Revelationes S. Brigittæ. Antw. 1611.

ſtrange effects of the power of imagination, or a Religious Melancholy; and to that Book the *Pope* in his Bull refers us: and if any thing can be more conſiderable than the *Popes* authority, the whole *Roman Church* in the prayers upon S. *Brigits* day, *do confeſs theſe Revelations to have come immediately from God to her*; and in one of the Leſſons for that day, *do magnifie the multitude of her Divine Revelations.* But to ſay truth, the *Church* of *Rome* allows fair play in the caſe, for it magnifies S. *Catherine* as much as S. *Brigit*: for her *holy Extaſies* are mentioned in the *Leſſons* upon her day, in one of which *were five rays, coming from the five wounds of our Saviour to five parts of her body*; *and ſhe* (being wonderful humble) *prayed our Lord, that the wounds might not appear* (for fear ſhe ſhould have been thought as holy as S. *Francis*) *and immediately the colour of the blood was changed, into pure light upon her hands, and feet, and heart. And her Confeſſor* Raimund (who is always a principal man in theſe things, as *Matthias a Suecia* was to S. *Brigit*) *without whom ſhe was adviſed from Heaven to do nothing, ſaw theſe ſplendid wounds upon her body*; (but by what inſtrument did he ſee the wound in her heart?) Well, though we Hereticks are not apt to be too credulous in theſe caſes, the *Church of Rome* very gravely tells us in the next Leſſon, *that her learning was not acquired, but infuſed*; *by which ſhe anſwered the moſt profound Doctors, in the moſt difficult ſpeculations in Divinity*; but theſe were nothing to *her Revelations*, and the ſervice ſhe

Prev. Rom. 8. Octobr. p. 1017.

Brev. Rom. Ap. 30. p. 808.

did

did the Church of *Rome* by them, in a time of *Schism*. But one gift she had above S. *Brigit*, which was that while she was on earth she could not only see, but *smell souls* too; and could not endure *the stench of wicked souls*, as *Raynaldus* tells us from her Confessor *Raimund*: a gift very few had, besides her and *Philip Nerius* the Father of the *Oratorians*; for *Raynaldus* one of his Order, tells us from *Bacius* the Writer of his life, *that he was sometimes so offended with the smells of filthy souls, that he would desire the persons to empty the Jakes of their souls.* Such divine *Noses* had these two *Saints* among them! A degree of *Enthusiasm*, above the *Spirit* of *discerning* any *Quakers* among us have ever pretended to. Pope *Pius* the second in the Bull of *Canonization* of S. *Catherine*, not only acknowledgeth a *gift of Prophecy* to have been in her, but that sometimes her Extasies were so great, that she was sensible of no kind of pain in them. And S. *Brigit* was often seen much above ground in her devotions; and one saw *Rivers*, and another *Fire* came out of her mouth; but I think not at the same time. These are things we rake not the old Kennels of the *Golden Legend* for, but are at this day allowed and approved of in the *Roman Church*; and *their days kept*, and they *prayed to*, upon the account of such things as these are.

Raynald. Annales Eccl. sub. A.D. 1388. n. 55.

Raynal. ib.

Bzov. Annals A.D. 1370. n. 20.

§. 3. Yet still we are to seek what is to be done, when two Revelations contradict each other? for the *Dominicans* are as peremptory for the Revelation of S. *Catherine*, as their ad-

Revelations contrary to each other approved by the Roman Church.

adversaries are for that of S. *Brigit*. Two bold Fellows called *Henricus de Hassia* and *Sybillanus* knew no other way, but to reject both as *illusions* and *fancies*; but what becomes then of the *Popes* and *Councils* infallibility, who have approved both? *Franciscus Picus Mirandula* being a Learned and Ingenuous man, confesseth himself at a loss; both being concerning a thing passed, there must be truth on one side, and falshood on the other: for the case is not the same, saith he, as to past and future things, in which a condition may be understood. By which means S. *Bernard* escaped, when he promised great success to an expedition into the Holy Land, and they who went in it found the quite contrary. But at last he gives us leave to conjecture his meaning, when he saith, *That if any thing be false in a Prophecy, though some prove true, we have cause to suspect all; especially if it come from women, whose judgements are weak, and their passions vehement, and imaginations easily possessed with what they are most desirous of, and least able to distinguish between the strength of imagination, and a divine Revelation:* But as to that particular case of S. *Catharine* and S. *Brigit*, where both were women; he saith, *The Divines were generally for the former, and the Monks for the latter; but which was in the truth, he thinks cannot be known upon earth.*

Del Rio disquis. Mag. l. 4. c. 1. q. 3. Sect. 4.

Joh. Francisc. Picus Mirand. de rerum prænot. l. 9. c. 2.

C. 4.

Del Rio ib. *Martin Del Rio*, discoursing of the *Revelations* of Canonized Saints who were women in the *Church* of *Rome*, reckons S. *Angela* a *Carmelitess*, whose Book of *Revelations* came out

out above four hundred years ago; S. *Gertrude*, *A. D.* 664. S. *Hildegardis* in *Germany*, *A. D.* 1180. and about the same time S. *Elizabeth* of *Sconaugh*, all whose Revelations were published, and the last collected by *Roger* an *English Cistertian*; and in latter times he mentions S. *Brigit* and S. *Catharine*, *whose Revelations*, he saith, *were opposed by some, but he declares for his part, that he is not at all moved with their arguments, for that would diminish too much the honor due to those holy Spouses of Christ*, as he calls them; but in truth he confesses, *the honor of their Church is concerned in it*; *for*, saith he, *several Popes upon diligent examination have allowed and approved these Revelations*, as Eugenius *the third did those of* Hildergardis, *as well as* Boniface *the ninth*, *those of S.* Brigit. For the Argument from the contradiction of these Revelations, he knows not how to come off, but by a charge of Forgery *on the Dominican side*; and why might not they as well return it on the other? unless *Matthia a Suetia*, Confessor to S. *Brigit*, were more infallible than *Raimundus*, or those who believed S. *Catharine*.

But this is not the only case, wherein these *Female Revelations* so much approved by the *Church* of *Rome* are contradictory to each other, in those things whereon the proof of a point of doctrine depends. For who knows not, to what end the *Revelation* of S. *Gregories* delivering the soul of *Trajan* by his prayers, is so frequently urged? and this is confirmed by a Revelation of S. *Brigit* to that purpose; from whence *Salme-*

Brigittæ Revel. l. 4. c. 13. Salvero in 1. ad. Cor. 15. disp. 27. Baron. Annal. A. D. 604 n. 59.

ron calls it *an unanswerable argument*, and *Alphonsus Ciacconius*, published, by the *Popes* authority, an *Apology* for that *Revelation*. Yet *Baronius* tells us, that S. *Mathildis* had a *Revelation to the contrary, and if it were not contradictory to S.* Brigits, *it must be contradictory to it self*. And therefore he very fairly rejects them all, but with what honor to his *Church* (which had before approved them) I can by no means understand. And *Bellarmin* to the Revelation of *Mathildis*, (wherein she desired to know what became of the souls of *Sampson*, *Solomon*, *Origin*, and *Trajan*; *and God answered her, that none should know what he had done with them*) opposes *another Revelation* wherein the soul of *Origen* was seen, together with that of *Arius* and *Nestorius*, in Hell. So infallible are these *Revelations*, even when they contradict each other.

Bell. de Purgat. l. 2. c. 8.

Bellarm. de Purg. l. 2. c. 7.

How often have *Visions* and *Apparitions* of souls been made use of, to prove the doctrine of *Purgatory*? Witness the famous testimonies to this purpose out of S. *Gregories* Dialogues, and *Bedes History*; which latter is at large recited (being very proper for it) in the late *great Legend* published by Mr. *Cressy* under the name of a *Church History*; who justifies the substance of the story, as far as it concerns the doctrine of *Purgatory*; although he doth not think the person really dead, but only in a *Trance*; which is all one to our purpose, as long as such Arguments as these are made use to prove matters of faith by.

Cressy's Church-History, l. 20. c. 10.

We

We need not go so far back as *Gabriel Biel*, to shew that the doctrine of *Transubstantiation* hath been proved by the appearance *of a Child in a Host*; such an Argument hath been lately published to the World: and *Bellarmin* reckons up several to this purpose; one, *wherein instead of Bread, was seen real Flesh*; and another, *wherein Christ was seen in the form of a Child.* Which are well attended *with S.* Anthony *of* Padua's *Horse*, which would never have left his Provender to Worship the *Host*, unless he had seen some notable sight there.

Biel in Canon. Missæ. l. 51.

Bellar. de Sacram. Euchar. l. 3. c. 8.

And he very doughtily proves *Auricular Confession, by a certain Vision of a tall and terrible man with his Book in his hand, which blotted out presently all the sins which the humble Thief confessed upon his knees to the Priest*: but he hath not proved, that terrible man did not represent the *Devil*, who by that Ceremony might shew that he turned over the keeping of his Books of *Accompts* to the *Priest*, who upon Confession, might tell mens sins, as well as he could do without.

Bell. de pœnit. l. 3. cap. 12.

But they have not only attempted to prove matters of Doctrine, by these things, but things have been defined in the *Church*, meerly upon the *credit of private Revelations.* So the *Spanish Ambassador* urges the *Pope* smartly upon the Revelations of S. *Brigit*, *That there were many of his Predecessors that had determined more things in the Church, partly relying upon private Revelations therein, whose authority was not greater than hers were.* Pius 1. he saith, *determined*

Festivals appointed on the credit of Revelations.

Legatio de Concept. V. Mariæ Sect. 3. n. 42. p. 371.

the Controverſie of Eaſter-day, *upon the credit of a Revelation made to* Hermes. Urban 4. *Inſtituted the Feſtival of* Corpus Chriſti, *in oppoſition to the deniers of Tranſubſtantiation, upon the inſtinct and Revelation of a certain Woman.* Paul *the Hermite was Canonized for a Saint, upon the Authority of a Viſion and Revelation to* Anthony; *the one of his ſoul flying to Heaven, the other of his being there.* The Feaſt *of the Apparition of the Arch-Angel* Michael, *which is conſtantly obſerved in the Church of* Rome, *depended upon a Revelation to the Biſhop of* Siponto, *and a few Drovers upon the Mountain* Garganus. Theſe are things briefly touched by the *Ambaſſador*; but it will not be amiſs, to give a more particular account of thoſe inſtances which concern the *Inſtitution of Feſtival Solemnities*; by which it will appear that they are *Fanatical* even in their *Superſtitions.* Pope *Urban* 4. in the *Bull* ſtill extant for the Celebration of *Corpus Chriſti day*, mentions that as one of the great reaſons of appointing it, *that while he was in a lower capacity, he underſtood that a Revelation had been made to certain Catholicks, that this Feaſt ſhould be obſerved in the Church.* This which is only intimated here is at large explained by *Joh. Dieſtemius Blarus Prior* of S. *James* in *Liege*, where theſe things happened. "In an *Hoſpital* hard "by the Town, he tells us, there was a ſa- "mous *Virgin* called *Juliana*, which had "many Extaſies and Raptures, and ſo Pro- "phetical a Spirit as to diſcern the thoughts "and intentions of her Neighbours hearts;

Bullar. Rov. Tom. 1. p. 147. Cherubin.

Apud Rzov. Anal. Tom. 13. A.D. 1250. c. 16.

"ſhe

" ſhe wreſtled with Devils, diſcourſed with the
" Apoſtles, and wrought many Miracles. But
" one thing peculiar to her was, that in her
" Prayers ſhe almoſt alwayes ſaw the Moon in
" her brightneſs, but with a ſnip taken off
" from her roundneſs: at which ſhe was much
" troubled, but by no means could get it out
" of her Phancy. At laſt *God* was pleaſed to
" reveal it to her, that the Moon ſignified the
" preſent Church, and that fraction the want
" of one ſolemnity more to be obſerved in it:
" upon which ſhe received a command from
" Heaven, to proclaim the obſervation of this
" ſolemnity. For twenty years, ſhe prayed that
" God would excuſe her, and make choice of a
" more worthy perſon; but none being found,
" ſhe communicates it to *Johannes de Lauſenna*,
" and he to *Jacobus de Trecis* then *Arch-dea-*
" *con* of *Liege*, and afterwards *Urban* 4. But
" although all the perſons to whom it was
" communicated, highly approved it; yet ſhe
" was not ſatisfied till (*one of her Goſſips*,)
" named *Iſabella*, after a whole years praying
" for it, had the ſame thing revealed to her,
" with that circumſtance, that this Feaſt had
" alwayes been among the Secrets of the B. Tri-
" nity; but now the time was come, that it
" ſhould be publiſhed to the World: and ſhe, in
" one of her extaſies, ſaw very diſtinctly all the
" heavenly orders upon their faces, ſupplicating
" God, that to confirm the faith of Chriſti-
" ans, this day might be ſpedily obſerved.
" This *Iſabella* was ſo much intoxicated
" by this Viſion, ſaith the Author, that out

" of

"of the abundance of her ſpiritual drunken-
"neſs (they are his own words) ſhe declared
"ſhe would promote the obſerving this Feaſt,
"although the whole world ſhould oppoſe her.
"Which (we way well think) *Juliana* re-
"joyced to hear; and hence forwards, they
"joyned counſels to advance this ſolemnity.
"*Juliana* gets an ignorant young Prieſt, to
"draw up an Office for it; and while he writ,
"ſhe prayed, by which the Office was ſo well
"compoſed, that it would melt (ſaith he) the
"hardeſt hearts into devotion: and when it
"was ſeen by Divines, they ſaid it was not
"written by man, but inſpired by God him-
"ſelf. And yet when Pope *Urban* publiſhed
"his Bull, upon the credit of theſe revelations,
"for the Celebration of this Feaſt, he appoint-
"ed *Tho. Aquinas* to compoſe an Office for it,
"and rejected that divine Office of *Juliana*.
The Epiſtle of *Urban* to *Eva*, one of the *Nuns* of *Liege*, and a companion of the two Virgins, is ſtill extant in *Dieſtemius*, and *Binius* about the inſtitution of this *Feaſt* of *Corpus Chriſti*. And that this was the occaſion of this Feſtival, is not delivered alone by *Dieſtemius*, but by *Arnoldus Boſtius* and *Petrus Præmonſtratenſis*, by *Vignier* and *Molanus*, (as *Binius* confeſſeth of this laſt,) who can no more be ſuſpected of partiality in this caſe than *Dieſtemius*; but we need no other evidence than the *Popes* own *Bull*. The ſtory of the other is remarkable too, for it is read conſtantly in the *Roman* Breviary, upon the eighth of *May*. *It came to paſs that among the Droves of Cattle, the Bull*

Breviar. Roman. 8. Maii. p. 815.

of

of a certain inhabitant wandred from the rest, which having long sought for, they found in the entrance of a Cave. And when one shot an arrow at him to destroy him, the arrow was driven back again to him that shot it. Which thing so affrighted them all, that they durst not come near the Cave; the Sipontines *consult their Bishop, who appointed three dayes fasting and Prayer to seek God in the case; after the three dayes, the Arch-angel* Gabriel *admonisheth the Bishop, that place was in his custody, and by that act he shewed, that they ought to worship God there, in remembrance of him and his fellow Angels. The Bishop and people go accordingly thither, and they find the place already formed into the fashion of a Temple, and there they perform divine Offices, where many Miracles were afterwards wrought. Not long after, Pope* Boniface *Dedicated the Church of St.* Michael, *the third of the Calends of* October, *in which the Church celebrates the memory of all Angels, but this day is consecrated to the apparition of* Michael *the Arch-angel.* Thus far the 5th. and 6th. Lessons of the present *Roman Breviary*; whereby we understand what infallible grounds the *Church* of *Rome* proceeds upon, in all her definitions and observations.

Revelations still owned by them.

§. 5. And is it not a hard case now, we should be so often told of *Fanaticism* among us, by the members of the *Roman Church?* Where are the Visions and Revelations ever pleaded by us in any matter of *Doctrine?* Did we ever discard any of the *Roman opinions*, or practices upon the account of *Revelations*, made to Women, or to any private persons?

Do

Do we reſolve the grounds of any doctrine of ours, into any Viſions and Extaſies? have we any *Feſtivals* kept upon ſuch occaſions? Do we collect *Fanatical Revelations*, and ſet them out with comments upon them, as *Gonſalvus Durantus* hath done thoſe of St. *Brigitt*? Have we any mother *Juliana*'s among us? or do we publiſh to the world the *Fanatick Revelations* of *diſtempered brains*, as Mr. *Creſſy* hath very lately done, to the great honour and ſervice of the Roman Church, *the ſixteen Revelations of Divine Love ſhewed to a devout ſervant of our Lord* (and Lady too) *called Mother* Juliana? We have, we thank God, other wayes of imploying our devout retirements, than in reading ſuch fopperies as thoſe are. Excellent men! that debarr the people reading the *Scriptures* in their own tongue, and inſtead of them put them off with ſuch Fooleries, which deſerve no other name at the beſt than the *efforts* of *Religious madneſs*. Were we to take an eſtimate of *Chriſtian Religion* from ſuch Raptures and Extaſies, ſuch Viſions and Entertainments as thoſe are, how much muſt we befool our ſelves to think it *ſenſe*? Did ever *H. N*, *Jacob Behmen*, or the higheſt *Enthuſiaſts* talk at a more extravagant rate than this *Juliana* doth? As when ſhe ſpeaks of *our being incloſed in the mid-head of God, and in his neck-head, and in his benignity, and in his luxomneſs, though we feel in us wrath, debate, and ſtrife*: Of *being ſubſtantially united to God*; and that, *God is that goodneſs which may not be wrath, for God is not but goodneſs*: *our*

16 Revelations of divine love. Ch. 49. p. 112. Ch. 5. p. 12. Ch. 46. p. 105.

Soul

ſoul is oned to him, unchangeable goodneſs; and between God and our ſoul is neither wrath nor forgiveneſs in his ſight, for our ſoul is ſo fulſomely oned to God of his own goodneſs, that between God and our ſoul may be right naught. That *in mankind that ſhall be ſaved is comprehended all; that is to ſay, all that is made and the maker of all; for in man is God, and God is all, and he that loveth thus he loveth all:* That *our ſoul is ſo deep grounded in God, and ſo endleſly treaſured that we may not come to the knowing thereof, till we have firſt knowing of God, which is the maker to whom it is oned; and therefore if we will have knowing of our ſoul, and commoning, and dalliance therewith, it behooveth to ſeek into our Lord God in whom it is incloſed: and that worſhipful City that our Lord Jeſu ſitteth in, it is our ſenſuality, in which he is incloſed; and our kindly ſubſtance is becloſed in Jeſu with the bleſſed ſoul of Chriſt, reſting in the Godhead: and notwithſtanding all this we may never come to the full knowing of God till we know firſt clearly our own ſoul; for into the time that it is in the full mights, we may not be all holy, and that is, that our ſenſuality by the vertue of Chriſts paſſion be brought up into the ſubſtance, with all the profits of our tribulation, that our Lord ſhall make us to get by mercy and grace. I had in party touching, and it is grounded in kind; that is to ſay, our reaſon is grounded in God which is ſubſtantially kindneſs.* Afterwards ſhe diſcourſeth *of three properties in the Holy Trinity, of the Fatherhead, of the Motherhood, and of the Lordſhip; and*

Ch. 9. p. 24.

Ch. 45. p. 144.

P. 145.

Ch. 58. p. 151.

ſhe

ſhe further ſaw that the ſecond perſon which is our Mother ſubſtantially, the ſame dear worthy perſon is now become our Mother ſenſual; for we be double of Gods making, ſubſtantial and ſenſual. We may juſtly admire, what eſteem Mr. *Creſſy* had of that *Lady*, to whoſe devout retirements he ſo gravely commends the blaſphemous and ſenſeleſs tittle tattle of this *Hyſterical* Goſſip. It were endleſs, to repeat the Canting and Enthuſiaſtick expreſſions, which ſignifie nothing in Mother *Juliana*'s Revelations; and one would wonder to what end ſuch a Book were publiſhed among us, unleſs it were to convince us of this great truth, that we have not had ſo great *Fanaticks* and *Enthuſiaſts* among us, but they have had greater in the *Roman Church*. And by this means they may think to prevail upon the *Fanaticks* among us, by perſwading them, that they have been ſtrangely miſtaken concerning the *Church* of *Rome*, in theſe matters; that ſhe is no ſuch enemy to *Enthuſiaſms* and *Revelations*, as ſome believe; but that in truth ſhe hath not only alwayes had ſuch, but given great *approbation* and *encouragement* to them. So that among all their viſions they do but mix ſome that confirm their particular Doctrines; as the *Viſions* of *Juliana* concerning *the great Worſhip of the B. Virgin from her Son*, the *holy Vernacle at* Rome, and ſuch like *ſopperies*; theſe make all the reſt very acceptable among them.

§. 6.

§. 6. 2. That which they account the *most perfect way of life*, hath been instituted by *Enthusiastick persons*, and upon the credit of *visions* and *revelations*; and the highest way of devotion in that Church, is meer Enthusiasme.

The Monastick orders founded on Enthusiasm.

1. That the *Religious orders* were instituted among them by *Enthusiastick persons*, upon the credit of their *visions* and *revelations*. The most celebrated orders at this day in the Roman Church are the *Benedictines*, *Carthusians*, *Dominicans*, *Franciscans* and *Jesuits*, and if I can prove this concerning each of these, we shall see how much *Fanaticism* hath contributed to the support of the *Roman Church*. And it is a very fair way towards the proof of it, that *Bellarmin* confesseth concerning the four first, and that of *Romoaldus*, *that they were at first instituted by St.* Benedict, *St.* Romoaldus, *St.* Bruno, *St.* Dominick, *St.* Francis, *by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost*; and for *Ignatius Loyola*, if he do not appear as great a *Fanatick* as ever hath been in the world, we shall be contented to be upbraided with the charge of *Fanaticism* among us. It is observable in the life of St. *Benedict*, as St *Gregory* relates in the second Book of his *Dialogues*, that he was a great hater of humane learning; and that was the first occasion of his retiring from the World, being very much afraid a little knowledge should have destroyed him. He therefore forsook, not only his Studies, but his Fathers house and business; being as St. *Gregory* saith, *knowingly ignorant, and wisely unlearned*: he might as well

Bellar. de Pontif. Rom. l. 3. c. 18.

Gregor. Dial. l. 2.

well have ſaid ignorantly learned, and fooliſhly wiſe. One might have ſuſpected, it had been rather hatred of his Book than devotion, at his age, which made him run away from School, and his Fathers houſe; but one of his Viſions in his Cave, makes it more probable there was ſome other occaſion of it. But however, away he goes, and only an old *Nurſe* with him, and he requited her ſoon for it; for he by his Prayers ſet together the winnowing Sieve which ſhe had broken in pieces, which was after hanged up before the doors of the *Church* to the *Lombards* times. But this is nothing to his being three years in a *Cave* without the knowledge of any but St. *Roman*, who let him down victuals by a rope and a *Bell*; and the *Devil* owing him a great ſpight, threw a huge ſtone and broke the Bell. Here he lay ſo cloſe, that he was fain to be diſcovered by a viſion; and was ſo devout, that he had forgotten *Eaſter day*, till he was put in mind of it by a perſon, who by a viſion was ſent to him: and was ſo little like a man, that the ſhepherds took him for a *beaſt* lying in a den. But at laſt he is brought to light, and found to be a wonderful perſon; (for among ſuperſtitious people, ignorance and devotion are moſt admired together) and now many are ſent to him for education; having conquered his amorous paſſions, by rowling himſelf naked among thorns and nettles: which thorns, a long time after, St. *Francis* grafted Roſes upon, (as *Bollandus* well obſerves) which bear in the coldeſt part of Winter; and of them *Roſe water* is made, which is ſent

Bollandi Acta Sanctorum Martii. 21. not. in vit. Bened. c.1.

ſent as a preſent to the *greateſt Princes.* He had an admirable Sagacity, in ſpying *Devils*; for he *Cap. 4.* ſaw a little *black Devil*, which led away a *Monk* from Prayers; and was fain to pray two dayes with *Pompeianus* and *Maurus*, that *God* would afford them the *Grace* to ſee him too: and at laſt *Maurus* being young, and his ſight good, ſaw him; but *Pompeianus*, being older and wiſer, could not. However, St. *Bennet* ſent the *little Devil* packing with a ſtroke of his rod; as he did at other times, with the ſign of the croſs: and eaſily cauſed a ſtone to be lifted up whereon the Devil ſate, which could not be *c. 9.* ſtirred before his coming. It would take up too much time, to tell of his Miracles; my buſineſs is only with his *viſions* and *revelations*, by which he could not only foretell things to come, but could diſcover abſent things; ſo that the *Monks* could not eat out of his ſight, *c. 12, 13.* but he could tell as well, as if he ſaw the meat in their teeth, when they denyed it. He *c. 14, 15.* diſcovered *Riggo*'s fraud, when he came to him in *Totila*'s habit; and told *Totilas*, how long he ſhould raign; nay, if we believe St. *Gregory*, he knew the *ſecrets* of the *Divinity*, *c. 16.* being one *Spirit* with *God*: no wonder then the unhappy Boy could not hide one Flask of Wine, nor the *Monks* receive handkerchiefs of *c. 18, 19.* the Women, but he found it out: But admirable was his ſight of his Siſter *Sholaſtica*'s ſoul, *c. 34.* entring into Heaven in the ſhape of a Dove: and another time of the ſoul of *Germanus Biſhop* of *Capua*, in a fiery Circle carryed by *Angels* to Heaven: And above all, was his *c. 35.*

seeing all the world under one ray of the *Sun*; which he could not do, *Gregory* concludes without a Divine internal light; upon which a dispute hath been raised in the Schooles, whether St. *Benedict* saw the *divine Essence* or no? *Aquinas* thinks not, but only that he had an extraordinary revelation; *Vasquez* doth not seem much to oppose it, but upon two grounds; the one very considerable, that we never read the *Virgin Mary* did it, who ought to have the highest share in revelations and visions: the other only a plain place of *Scripture*; *No man hath seen God at any time*; *the only begotten Son of the Father he hath revealed him*: As though that were intended to exclude St. *Benedict*, and other Founders of *Religious orders*, and not rather the *Patriarchs*, *Prophets* and *Apostles* who came not near them in *Visions* and *Miracles*. But no one hath handled this profound question, with that care and accuracy which *Angelus de Nuce* hath done, in his *Notes* upon St. *Gregories* life of St. *Benedict*: he tells us therefore, the *Question* is not concerning the highest sort of abstractive contemplation of any thing short of the Divine essence, for that, he saith, none doubt of; but of an *intuitive vision*, by which the divine essence is seen clearly in it self immediately, and not in any created image: the *Negative* he grants is held by *Aquinas*, and many of the *Schoolmen*: but yet he saith, many Schoolmen of great note are for the *affirmative*; and he deduces many arguments to prove it, from St. *Gregories* words: but that which addes most weight to it, besides the

Possevin. Appar. v S. Benedict. Aquin. Sum. 2. 2. qu. 180. art. 5. ad 3. Vasquez in 1, 2. disp. 56. n. 5. Joh. 1. 18.

Chronicon. Monast. Cassinens. p. 65 Lut. Paris 1668.

the number of authors quoted by him, is that *Urban* 8. in a Bull upon the feast of *St. Benedict*, A. D. 1632. doth expressly assert it. And *Joh. Bona*, a present *Cardinal* at *Rome*, saith, *that St.* Benedict *was rapt up into the third Heavens, where he heard the Choire of Angels, and saw God face to face*: for which, besides *Gregory*, he cites St. *Bernard*, *Rupertus Tuitiensis*, *Bonaventure*, *Dionysius Carthusianus*, *Maximilian Sandeus*, and others. And addes to this as extraordinary a thing as any hath been yet said of him, *that he and his Sister* Scholastica *sung very distinctly in their Mothers Wombs*; *a presage* (saith he) *of the chearful singing of their Order*. For which he quotes several Authors of the *Benedictines*; and although he grants it may be suspected, because it doth not occurr in the more ancient writers, yet he justifies it by many parellel stories. These things are enough, for St. *Benedicts Enthusiasme*. St. *Romoaldus* was as happy as St. *Benedict*, in his ignorance. For, as *Petrus Damiani* reports in his life, when he first entred himself under the discipline of *Marinus* the *Eremite*, he could hardly read his *Psalter*, though he had been a *Monk* three years before, and he adds it as a great instance of his patience, that when *Marinus* in teaching him, did often beat him with a wand upon the left side of his head, for his dulness, he desired his Master that he would now change his side, for he had by his strokes quite lost his hearing in his left eare: and yet he met with a worse companion, than *Marinus*;

Joh. Bona de divinâ Psalmodia. cap. 18. §. 3.

Pet. i. Damiani vit. S. Romoaldi cap. 4.

Cap. 7.

for, for five years together, he ſaith, the *Devil* lay upon his feet and his leggs in the night, that he could not eaſily ſtirr himſelf. He was ſo poſſeſſed with the thoughts of him, that a *Monk* could not knock at his Cell door, but he asked the *Devil*, what he did there in the Wilderneſs? and was ready to encounter with the *Devil*, when he found him to be one of his
Cap. 16. *Brethren.* But the *Devil* once got him down (as he imagined) while he was ſaying his *Pſalms*, and wounded him, and bruiſed him ſadly; but of a ſudden he roſe up as ſound as ever, and went on juſt where he left. All the crows and ugly birds he ſaw in the Wilderneſs,
Cap. 17. he fancied to be *Devils*, and challenged to fight with them; and exceedingly triumphed, when at his loud cries they flew away. He was
C. 2. converted by a *viſion* of St. *Apollinaris*, as his
C. 14. Father *Sergius* ran ſtark mad with a viſion of the *Holy Ghoſt*; he wept ſo abundantly that
C. 31. he never durſt ſay *Maſs* in publick, and bid his Brethren have a care of ſhedding too many tears, becauſe they hurt the ſight and the brain. Yet, by immediate revelation, he writ an excellent commentary, ſaith *Mugnotius*, on the Book of *Pſalms*; though not very agreeable to *Grammar*, ſaith *Petrus Damiani*; and being led by the Divine Spirit to the top of a Mountain, in his ſleep he ſaw Ladders reaching from thence to Heaven, and a great many *Monks* going up to Heaven upon them. A divine viſion indeed! and he meeting with *Maldulus*, who by great fortune had the ſame viſion, they preſently agreed about erecting a *Monaſtery* there:

Andreas Mugnotius de Eremo Camaldulenſi. lib. 1. *Pet. Damaz. vit. S. Romualdi c.* 50.

If

If the order of *Carthusians* did not begin, upon the story of the *Doctor* of *Paris* speaking those dreadful words after his death, which is delivered, say the defenders of it, by *sixty authors of the Roman Church*; yet it is agreed on all hands among them, that *Hugo*, who joyned with *Bruno* in laying the foundations of that order, *had a vision of Gods building a house, of seven stars conducting them* to the place called *la grand Chartreuse*, from whence the whole order hath taken its name. The *Carmelites* have an especial vision of *Simon Stock*, wherein the *B. Virgin*, upon his devout prayers to her, appeared with the habit in her hand, which she would have them wear, with a promise greater than ever her son made, that *whosoever dyed in that habit, should not perish by everlasting flames.*

Launoy de verâ causâ secessûs Brunonis in Eremum c. 5. p. 165. Launoy ib. p. 32, 69. 71. &c.

Launoy de viso Simonis Stockii. cap. 1.

§. 7. But St. *Francis*, and St. *Dominick*, were the persons whom *Innocent* the third saw in a Vision, supporting the tottering *Fabrick* of the *Lateran Church*; whereby he understood, what Props and Supporters those two Orders would be to the *Church of Rome*. From hence those high *Elogiums* are given of those two persons, by *Bonaventure*, *Antoninus*, *Bonius* and others; that they were the *two great lights of Heaven*, the *two Trumpets of Moses*, the *two Cherubims*, (or *rather the two Calves of Dan and Bethel*,) the *two breasts of the Spouse*, the *two Olive branches*, the *two Candlesticks*, the *two Witnesses*; almost all the noted *two's* of the Bible, but the *two Thieves*, and the *two Testaments*; and these, as will appear presently, were in no great esteem among

The Franciscan and Dominican Orders founded in Fanaticism. Rainald. Annal. Eccles. A.D. 1215. n. 17. Bonavent. vit. Franciſci, c. 3. Sect. 8. Sedulius in Elogiis S. Franc.

them. But St. *Francis* got the start of the other; for (if a *Canonized Saint* may be believed upon his Oath) *Bonaventure* did publickly swear at *Paris*, saith *Bernardinus à Bustis*, that *Christ did reveal it to him, that St.* John (Apocalyps. 7. 2.) *by the Angel ascending from the East having the seal of the living God, meant no other than St. Francis.* And therefore that is the *Motto* placed under his Picture; and is applyed the same way by *Pope Leo the tenth.* I shall not take the advantage, that is sufficiently given us by the Book of *Conformities*, the *Alcoran of the Franciscans*, and by the declared enemies of those Orders, to represent S. *Francis* by; but only take the account given of him, by persons of the greatest reputation in the *Roman Church*. *Cardinal Vitriaco*, who saith, he saw him when he went to *Damiata*, calls him *a simple and illiterate man*. *Cardinal Bonaventure* is received as the most approved Writer of his life; and he describes him, as an *ignorant Enthusiast*; being bred a kind of *Woolen draper*, as appears by the selling his Cloth and his Horse at *Foligno*, after he left off trading upon the Vision of building Churches. His first conversion to *Quakerism* was by *Dreams and Visions*, in which he was sometimes *swallowed up in God*, as *Bonaventures* expression is, *and his soul melted at the sight of Christ*; *and was so tender hearted to the poor, that he sometimes put off his clothes to give them, sometimes unript them, sometimes cut them in pieces*, I suppose, that he might give to the more. *All this while, he had no Teacher but Christ*,

Bernard. à Bustis Rosar. p. 2. serm. 27.

Sedul. 16.

Jac. de Vitriaco Hist. Occident. c. 32. Rainald. A. 1219. n. 14.

Bonav. vit. Francis. c. 2. Cap. 1. sect. 6.

Cap. 2. sect. 1.

Christ, and learnt all by inspiration; but went besides himself at hearing the voice come from a Crucifix (as any one almost would have done) and it seems he was not well recovered when he came from the Cave; *for the people flocked about him as a mad man, and gave him the common Civility to such persons of dirt and stones:* and his *Father* entertained him with *dark rooms* and *chains*, as the fittest for him, whom neither words nor blows could bring to himself. But finding no amendment, he made him renounce his Patrimony, and so discharged him; which *S. Francis* did so readily, that he would not so much as keep the Clothes on his back: Whereby, saith *Bonaventure*, in a wonderful zeal, and being *drunk in the Spirit*, casting away his very Breeches, and being stark naked before them all, said thus to his Father, *Hitherto I called thee Father on earth; but hence forward I can securely say, Our Father which art in Heaven.* As though his duty to *God*, and his *Parents*, had been inconsistent. The *Bishop*, in whose presence all this was done, gave order to have his nakedness covered, highly admiring his zeal; and he no sooner had got some rags about him, but he falls *to making Crucifixes in Mortar with his own hands*, as Children do Babies in the dirt. In this height of *Fanaticism* he goes about, and preaches to the people, *whose words pierced their hearts*, much sooner than sense and reason would have done: and he soon brought the superstitious and ignorant multitude, to a great admiration of him; for his very way of saluting the people, he pretended, *he had by revelation*; and as our

Sect. 2.

Sect. 4.

Brev. Roman. 4. *Octob. Lect.* 4.

Cap. 3. *sect.* 1.

Quakers keep on their Hats, so he might put his off by the Spirit. At last one *Bernard* joyns
Sect. 2. with him, but St. *Francis* tells him, *They must seek God for direction what to do*; and after prayers, *he being a great worshipper of the Trinity, in honour to it opens the Gospel three times, and the first three sentences he met with, were to be the rule of their Order:* their second Brother was F. *Gyles*, *who though an Ideot and a simple*
Sect. 3. *man, was full of God*, as he saith, *and had so many extasies and raptures that he seemed to live*
Sect. 5. *rather among Angels than men.* One day when St. *Francis* was alone in a solitary place, *He fell into an extasie of joy, and had full assurance of the remission of his sins*; *and being transported beyond himself, he was caught up into a wonderful light, wherein his mind being inlarged,*
Sect. 7. *he foresaw all that should come to pass concerning his Order.* His number being increased, to *Rome* he goes, to confirm his *Order*; the *Pope* rejected him with scorn, *but in the night he saw a Palm growing between his feet into a goodly Tree*; which he wisely interpreting to be St. *Francis*, sent for him, and promised him fair things; and upon the other *Vision* of his supporting the *Lateran Church*, he approves his Rule, and establishes his *Order*. And his whole life afterwards, was agreeable to this beginning: and the Rule of his Order he called, as *Possevine* tells us,
Possevin. Apparat. p. Franciscus. *The Book of life, the hope of salvation, the marrow of the Gospel, the ladder of Heaven, the key of Paradise, the Eternal Covenant.* Let any *Fanaticks* be produced among us, (though we are far from looking on them as *the*

sup-

ſupporters of our Church) who have exceeded S *Francis*, in their actions, or expreſſions. S. *Brigit* ſaith of the Rule of S. *Francis*, *That it was not dictated, or compoſed by the wiſdom of man, but by God himſelf; nay, every word therein, was inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt*; which, ſhe ſaith likewiſe, *of all the other Rules of Religious Orders*. What horrible blaſphemy is this, which is ſo ſolemnly approved in the *Church* of *Rome* for *divine Revelations*? But leſt *Dominicus* ſhould ſeem to come behind S. *Francis* in *Viſions*, he tells him at *Rome* where they met, *That it was revealed to him in a Viſion, that Chriſt was juſt coming to deſtroy the world for the wickedneſs of it; and his Mother ſtopt him, and told him ſhe had two ſervants would reform it, whereof himſelf was one, and Chriſt approved of him, as one that would do his work; but his companion he did not know, till he met S.* Francis, *and ſo they embraced one another*. Which Viſion out of his great humility S. *Francis* reported, having it from the others own mouth. I ſhall not inſiſt on any more of *Dominicus*; nor on the blaſphemous Images ſet up in S. *Marks Church* at *Venice*, one of which was of S. *Paul*, with this Inſcription, *By him we go to Chriſt*; the other of *Dominicus*, with this, *but by him we go eaſier to Chriſt*; but I ſhall proceed to their followers, among whom we meet with one of the moſt blaſphemous pieces of *Enthuſiaſm* the world hath ever known.

Brigittæ Revel. l. 7. c. 20. p. 559, Col. 1.

Rainald. A. D. 1216. n. 48.

Wolfii Lection. Memorab. cent. 13. p. 509.

§. 8.

The blaſphemous Enthuſiaſm of the *Mendicant Fryers.* *Naucler. Chronog. Vol. 2 Gen. 40. p. 900 Spondani Annals Eccleſ. A. D. 1204. v. 17. Bellarm. Chronol. ad A.D. 1209. Ceſar. Bulæus in Hiſtor. univerſ. Pariſ. Tom. 3. p. 49.*

§. 8. For which we are to underſtand, that in the beginning of the thirteenth *Century*, one *Almaricus*, a Student in *Paris*, was ſuſpected for ſome dangerous Opinions, for which he was ſentenced to recant; and ſoon after dyed. Among theſe Opinions he broached this blaſphemy, which was privately inſtilled into his followers; *That every perſon of the Trinity had his ſucceſſive time of ruling the world; that the Law of the Father continued till Chriſts coming; the Law of the Son to their time; and then the time of the Holy Ghoſt was to begin. In which the uſe of Sacraments was to ceaſe, and all internal Adminiſtrations; and every one then was to be ſaved by the inſpiration and inward grace of the Holy Ghoſt, without any external actions. They ſo highly extolled Love, that what would have been a ſin without it, they thought to be nothing with it; as Fornication, Adultery, &c. and promiſed impunity to the women with whom they committed theſe things, becauſe they ſaid God was only good, and not juſt.* That theſe were their opinions, is delivered by *Rigordus* who lived in that age, and was upon the place, being a *Monk* of S. *Denys*, and *Phyſician* to the *King of France*; and by *Eymericus* and *Pegna*, and many others. But by the care and endeavour of the *Biſhop and Univerſity* of *Paris*, though they had ſpread very far abroad, and with a great deal of ſecrecy, yet by the fraud and artifice of one imployed among them, who pretended to *Revelations* and the *Spirit* as highly as they could do, they were convicted, condemned, and ſome of them executed. Notwithſtanding

Rigordus in vita Philip. Auguſt. A.D. 1209. Eymeric. Direct. Inquiſit. p. 2. a. 7. Franciſc. Pegna. Not. in Direct. p. 1. pag. 6.

withstanding which severity, about fifty years after this, came forth a Book with the Title of *Evangelium æternum*, or the *Eternal Gospel* published by the *Mendicant Fryers*, and supposed to be written by *Johannes de Parma* about *A. D.* 1254. who was *General* of the *Franciscan Order*; but the Book was received, and defended by both Orders, as will presently appear. But it will be first necessary to consider what the doctrines are, which are contained in this Book; and if ever there were higher *Fanaticism* than is therein, or rather greater *blasphemies*, let them have leave to triumph. The most perfect account we have of it, is from *Nicol. Eymericus*, who was himself an *Inquisitor*, and tells us these Heresies or Errors are contained in it. *Eymeric. Direct. Inquisit. p. 2.*

1. That the doctrine of *Abbot Joachim* (a great *Fanatick*) excelled the doctrine of *Christ*, and consequently the New and Old Testament. *Bulæi Hist. Universit. Paris. To* 3. *f.* 5. *p.* 330.

2. That the *Gospel* of *Christ* is not the *Gospel* of the *Kingdom*, and therefore is not edifying.

3. That the New *Testament* is to be evacuated, or lose its force, as the Old hath already.

4. That the New *Testament* shall not remain in force, above six years longer; *viz.* to *A. D.* 1260.

5. That they which shall live beyond that time, shall be in the *state of perfection.*

6. That the *Gospel* of *Christ* shall give way to another *Gospel*; and so instead of the *Priesthood of Christ*, another *Gospel* shall succeed.

7. That

7. That no ſimple man is fit to inſtruct men in ſpiritual and eternal things, but they that *walk bare foot.*

8. That although *God* afflict the *Jews* in this world, yet he will ſave them, though they remain in *Judaiſm*; and will in the end deliver them from all the oppoſition of men, remaining ſuch as they are.

9. That the *Church* hath not yet brought forth *Children*, nor will do before the end of the temporal reign: which ſhall be after ſix years; and by this we are to underſtand, that the *Chriſtian Religion*, which hath brought forth many called to the faith of Chriſt, is not the Church.

10. That the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt* brings no man to *perfection.*

11. That the *Goſpel* of the *Holy Ghoſt* coming, or *Joachims* work obtained (called the *Eververlaſting Goſpel*, or of the *Holy Ghoſt*) the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt* ſhall be done away.

12. That no man in *Religious Orders* is bound to expoſe his life for defence of the faith, or preſerving the worſhip of Chriſt, but other men are.

13. That as when *John Baptiſt* came, the things that were before muſt needs be confuted, becauſe of new things coming in their place; ſo when the time of the *Holy Ghoſt* ſhall come, or the third ſtate of the world, the things that were before muſt be confuted, for the ſake of the *New* which are to come; from whence it muſt be underſtood, that the *New Teſtament* muſt be refuted, and the Old caſt away.

14. That

14. That *Christ* and his *Apostles* were not perfect in the contemplative life.

15. That the *Order* of the *Clergy* shall perish; but one of a *Religious Order* shall be preferred above all in dignity and honor; and that as the Authority under the *Father*, was committed to one of the married order, so under the *Holy Ghost* to one or some of the Order of *Monks*.

16. That those who are over the *Colledges* of *Monks*, ought in those days to think of departing from the *Seculars*, and prepare themselves to return to the ancient people of the *Jews*.

17. That the Preachers which shall be in the *last state* of the world, shall be of greater dignity and authority, than the Preachers of the *Primitive Church*.

18. That the *Preachers* and *Doctors* of *Religious Orders*, when they shall be infested by the *Clergy*, shall go over to the *Infidels*; and it is to be feared, lest they go thither for that end to bring them in battel against the *Roman Church*, according to the doctrine of S. *John*, *Apocalips*. 15.

These may suffice out of twenty seven, to let the world know, where the height of *Blasphemy* and *Fanaticism* was first hatched, and no one could imagine, that any who had the face or name of *Christians* should own these things; yet they came from those excellent and inspired persons of the newly founded *Religious Orders*. And if it had not been for the mortal hatred that then was between the Uni-

Univerſity of *Paris*, and the *Mendicant Fryers* (who uſurped the *Profeſſors* places in the *Univerſity* againſt their will) God knows how far this doctrine might have prevailed without the leaſt cenſure. For the Popes were extreamly partial to the *Friers*, and would hear no ill of them; they now finding them their moſt uſeful inſtruments in all their quarrels with Princes, the Secular Clergy and the People. So *Matth. Paris* relating the Story of the quarrels between the Univerſity and the *Friers*, tells, *That though the King and the City were for preſerving the priviledges of the Univerſity; yet the Friers being at the Popes devotion, and doing them a great deal of ſervice, were more acceptable in the Court of* Rome, *and therefore got the better of the Univerſity.* Nay, ſo zealous was *Alexander* the fourth, in the cauſe of the *Friers* againſt the *Univerſity*, that in the ſix years of his Popedom, he ſent out near *forty Bulls* againſt the *Univerſity*, of which not one now appears in the *Bullarium*: but moſt of them are preſerved in that accurate Preface, before the works of *Gul. de Sancto Amore*, the zealous Defender of the *Univerſity* againſt the encroachments of the *Friers*, and in the late Hiſtory of the *Univerſities* of *Paris*. In the midſt of theſe heats, ſome intimation was given the *Divines* of the *Univerſity*, of ſuch a Book, which was in great eſteem among the *Friers*, called *Evangelium æternum*, wherein were very dangerous doctrines, *which were* (ſaith *Matthew Paris*) *preached, read and taught by the Friers: and were put together by them in a Book called* Evangelium eter-

Matth. Pariſ. Hiſt. ad A.D 1255. *p.* 907.

Oper. Gul. de S. Amore præfat. p. 63. *Bulæi Hiſt. Univerſit. Paris, A.D.* 1255. *Tom.* 3.

Matth. Paris, ibid.

æternum, and taken (saith he) chiefly out of the Books of Abbot Joachim; and Richerius acknowledgeth, that the Book was composed by the Fryers, and that the Divines of Paris by some art got a Copy of it, and extracted some Heads out of it, which were contrary to faith: and upon that (as Du Boulz saith) they caused it to be burnt publickly at Paris. But not being satisfied herewith, they preached against it, as appears by a Sermon of Gul. de Sancto Amore, at the end of his Works; wherein he saith, That he had seen no small part of that Book, and he had heard, that it doth in all contain more than the Bible; and therein, he saith, it is taught, that the Sacraments of the Church are nothing, that the Gospel of Christ is not the true Gospel; and that the Book it self is the Gospel of the Holy Ghost, and the everlasting Gospel; and that the Gospel of Christ should be preached but for five years to come; that then men shall have another Rule of life, and the Church shall be otherwise managed. Which, saith he, is execrable and abominable to be spoken. But not content with bare preaching against them, he writ a very smart Book in the name of the University of Paris, de periculo novissimorum temporum, of the dangers of the last times; wherein he doth at large set forth the hypocrisie, idleness, flattery and baseness of the Fryers; but coming to shew the near approach of the dangers he mentions, he saith, It is now fifty five years (for about that time Almaric broached his Doctrine) that some have endeavoured to change the Gospel of Christ into

Richerii Chron. Senonens. l. 4. c. 37.

Bulæi Hist. p. 229.

G. l. de S. Amore oper. p. 500.

G. l. de S. Amor. de peric. novis. temp. c. 8. p. 38.

into another Gospel, which they said would be better, more perfect and worthy, which they call the Gospel of the Holy Ghost, or the Everlasting Gospel; which will by its coming turn the Gospel of Christ out of doors; as, saith he, *we are ready to prove, out of that cursed Gospel*; and a little after he adds, *That this Everlasting Gospel was publickly explained at* Paris, A. D. 1254 *from whence it is certain, that it would be preached, unless there were some other thing which hindred.* And afterwards he saith, *That in that Book, this everlasting Gospel is said to exceed the Gospel of Christ, as much as the light of the Sun doth that of the Moon, or the Kernel doth the Shell.* This Book of his extreamly incensed the *Friers*, and they presently sent informations against him to the *Pope*; and by their interest got his Book to be condemned, and burnt publickly before the *Pope* and the *Court* at *Anagnia*, and afterwards at *Paris*: to which purpose the *Pope* published a *Bull*, and denounced the sentence of Excommunication against any who should presume to defend it: and the Writer of it was deprived of his *Ecclesiastical Promotions* and banished *France*, as far as the *Popes* power could do it. All this was done in great haste, before the *Legats* from the *University* could appear; and when they came, three of them recanted and returned; only *Gul. de. S. Amore* resolved to stand it out, and answered all their objections, and persisted still in the accusation of that *horrible Book*: And at last prevailed so much, that the *Pope* was fain to condemn the *Evangelium aeternum*

Chronicon. Nicol. Trivetti ad A.D. 1256.

æternum together with *S. Amours* Book; but it appears how unwillingly he did it, by his carriage in it, which is related by *Matth. Paris*; *for he condemned the other Book solemnly, and caused the sentence to be publickly executed; but he gave order that this Book should be secretly burnt, and as much as might be without any offence to the Fryers.* Lo here the true zeal of the *Head* of the *Church!* A Book only writ against the *Mendicant Fryers* is condemned as *impious, wicked, execrable*, and what not, in the *Bull* against it; and a Book against *Christian Religion* in the highest manner, hardly procured to be condemned; and when it is, with great fear of displeasing the *Authors* and *approvers* of it. And since that time, they have been very careful to suppress the least mention of the *latter*, but very forward to set forth the other. For in the *Roman Bullarium*, the *Bull* against *S. Amours* Book is set forth at large; but not the least intimation of any such Book condemned as the *Evangelium æternum*. So much dearer to the *Pope* is the honour of *Fryers*, than of *Christ* and the *Christian Religion!* And therefore *S. Amour* said well in the University of *Paris*, before they went, *That it was to no purpose to go about to procure the condemning that Book at* Rome, *where it had so many Favourers*; the design of it being to advance the honour of Religious Orders, though to the overthrow of the Gospel of *Christ*. It is well these things were written and preserved by Writers of their *own Church*, and persons of the same *Age* (out of whom only I have

Matth. Paris A. D. 1257. p. 939.

Bullar. Rom. Tom. 1. Alex. 4. Bull 8. p. 137.

Bale. p. 330.

given account of them) for otherwiſe according to their uſual Method of confuting things which do not pleaſe them, they would be denyed with a mighty confidence, and the world ſhould be told, that theſe are only the *Lyes* and *Forgeries* of *Heretick*s. But theſe are to their ſhame preſerved in their own Books, and we can ſhew them the very words, if occaſion requires it.

The Fanaticiſm of the *Franciſcans* afterwards.

§. 9. Yet we are not to think, that only the preaching Fryers fell into theſe extravagancies; for the *Franciſcans* had a great hand in them too, and were as forward to promote that which they accounted their common intereſt. And notwithſtanding the Popes condemning the Book, ſaid to be taken out of *Abbot Joachims* Writings, yet his doctrine did in no long time after break forth again in the *Franciſcan* Order. For toward the latter end of the ſame Century, or as moſt think, in the beginning of the next, in the time of *Clement* the fifth, appeared one *Petrus Johannis de Oliva* a great Diſciple of *Joachims*, as *Guido Carmelita*, *Alphonſus a Caſtro*, and *Franciſcus Pegna* affirm. All the difference ſaith *Alphonſus*, between them was, that *Joachim* made the *ſpiritual State* to commence from the founding the *Benedictine* Order, but *Petrus Johannis* would have it begin only from S. *Francis*: Which *State*, as *Eymericus* relates, where he recounts his errors, *began with the* Franciſcan *Order*, *when the Angel of Chriſt*, *that is*, S. Francis, *did ſet his mark upon all his Souldiers*; *and that* S. Francis *appeared as Chriſt did*

Guido Carmelit. de hæreſ. Abb. Joachim & Petr. Joh. Alphonſus a Caſtro adverſ. hær. ſ. v. Apoſt. hær. 1. Pegna in direct. Inquiſit. p. 2. q. 9.

Eymeric. iv.

Hæreſ. 6.

did with his wounds upon him. For we are to understand, that S. *Francis* in one of his Visions upon the very day of the exaltation of the Cross, had the same *bleeding wounds* on his *hands, feet and side, which Christ had upon the Cross, and carried them for two years together before his death*; and left this should be suspected, *Pope Alexander the fourth* preached it in S. *Bonaventures* hearing, that himself *saw them*, as the sixth Lesson on S. *Francis* day in the *Roman Breviary*, and *Bonaventure* assure us. And who dares question the infallibility of the Popes eye-sight? Unless the Story in latter times of *Maria Visitationis*, as she was called, *Abbesse* of the *Annuntiation* in *Lisbon*, may give some suspicion of it. For this *Virgin* had gained so great a reputation for sanctity, not only in *Portugal*, but in *Spain*, *Italy* and the *East-Indies*, that she seemed to be a fit match for S. *Francis*. And she out-did him in the number of her wounds, for she had thirty two upon her head, caused by *Christs* putting his *Crown of Thorns* upon her; and in her hands, and feet, and side, they were as exact as in St. *Francis*; she made no difficulty of shewing them, if her Confessor bid her, but never otherwise; lest she should seem too much to glory in the honour which *Christ* had done her. This Confessor was no less a man, than *Ludovicus Granatensis*, a man highly commended for learning and piety, who as verily believed them, as *Pope Alexander* did those of S. *Francis*. One day in the Week she laid *raggs* to her wounds, upon which the print of the wounds was

Brev. Rom. 4. Oct. b. Lect 6. Bonaven. vit Francis. c. 18. Sect 9.

made. Theſe *rags* with incredible devotion, ſaith the Writer of the Story, were ſent to the *Pope* himſelf, and to the greateſt and moſt religious perſons in all parts, by whom they were received with great Veneration. And when he was *Inquiſitor* in *Sicily*, he ſaith, he ſaw many of them with her Picture, and a Book of her life and eminent ſanctity by a perſon of great authority, which were preſerved as precious things by the Vice-roy's Lady. But this is nothing to *Gregory the thirteenth* then *Pope*, who writ a Letter of encouragement to her, to go on in the ſame way of ſanctity ſhe had begun. She had been examined by the *Inquiſition*, and her wounds were allowed by them after diligent ſearch: But at laſt they found what ſhe aimed at, which was the *Revolt* of *Portugal* from *Spain*; which being once ſuſpected, ſhe is brought before the *Inquiſition*, and her *Sanctity* is condemned, her wounds declared to be a meer Impoſture, being artificially made by *red Lead*, and her ſelf ſentenced by the *Inquiſitors* to a very ſevere penance all her dayes *Decemb.* 8. *A. D.* 1588. I ſuppoſe, my Adverſary having been upon the place, hath often heard the truth of this; but if he doubts it, he may find it, as I have related it, in *Ludovicus a Paramo*. By which it is very eaſie to gheſs what it is, which gives and preſerves the reputation of theſe things in the *Roman Church*; for if this *Saint* had dyed before her deſign brake forth, we might have heard of her wounds in the *Roman Breviary*, as well as thoſe of St. *Francis*, and a *Feſtival* might have been kept

Lud. a Paramo de Origine Inquiſit. l.2. tit.2. c.15. n.11. tit.3. c.5. n.16.

kept in commemoration of her ſanctity, and her ſelf as religiouſly invocated, as the reſt of the *Popes* making. But ſuppoſing *Pope Aelxander the fourths* authority prevailed ſo much upon the people, to believe that S. *Francis* had the ſame wounds which *Chriſt* had, *&c.* No wonder then, it ſhould be written in the Book called, *The Flowers of* S. Francis, that *thoſe only were ſaved by the blood of Chriſt, who lived before* S. Francis; *but all that followed, were redeemed by the blood of* S. Francis. No wonder, this *Petrus Johannis* made *the Rule of* S. Francis, *to be the very ſame with the Goſpel, and that which Chriſt and his Apoſtles lived by: of which* S. Francis *was the greateſt obſerver, next to Chriſt and his Mother; and that as Chriſt when he was to reform the world, choſe twelve Apoſtles, ſo* S. Francis *had twelve Brethren, by whom the Evangelical Order was founded; that thoſe who oppoſed this Order, were the carnal perſecuting Clergy, in whom the Seat of the Beaſt is much more, than in the people; that in the time of this Myſtical Antichriſt, the Carnal Church ſhall oppoſe the doctrine, life and zeal of the Saints, and burn as it were with fire againſt them; but it ſhall be dryed up from all ſpiritual Wiſdom, and Grace, and the riches of Chriſt, and be expoſed to errors and deluſion as it was with the Jews and Greeks.* Thoſe who will not take the pains to ſee how faithfully I have tranſlated theſe words out of *Eymericus*, would imagine I have borrowed ſome of the canting language of the modern *Quakers*. But he goes on: ſaying, *That as* Vaſtni *the Queen being caſt off from the Kingdom and Marriage of* Ahaſſuerus, *the humble*

Wolfii Lect. Memor. Cent. 13. p. 522.

Eſther *was choſen to ſucceed in her place, and the King made a great Feaſt to his Princes and Servants: ſo in this laſt ſtate of the Church, the adulterous* Babylon, *the carnal Church being rejected, the ſpiritual Church muſt be exalted, and a great and ſpiritual Feaſt be kept to celebrate theſe Nuptials with; that under the Myſtical Antichriſt, there ſhall be overturnings and commotions, by which the Carnal Church ſhall be terribly ſtirred up and moved againſt the Evangelical Spirit of Chriſt; but that, the Whore of* Babylon, *the Carnal Church ſhall fall; in which time the Saints ſhall preach, ſaying, from this time it is no longer the Church of Chriſt, but the Synagogue of Satan, and the Habitation of Devils, which before ſaid in the pride of her heart, I ſit as a Queen in great honour and glory, I rule over my Kingdom, I ſit at eaſe, I am no Widow,* i. e. *I have Biſhops and Kings on my ſide:* that, *the* Roman *Church is that great Whore ſpoken of in the* Revelations, *which hath committed fornication with this world, having departed from the worſhip, and ſincere love, and the delights of Chriſt her Spouſe; and embraced the world, the riches and pleaſures of it, and the Devil, and Kings, and Princes, and Prelates, and all the lovers of this world.* That, *the Teachers of this ſpiritual State, are more properly the Gates to lead men into the wiſdom of Chriſt, than the Apoſtles themſelves.* Theſe things are expreſly delivered concerning the doctrine of this *Franciſcan* Fryer by the Inquiſitor *Eymericus*; I know, * *Wadding* in his *Franciſcan Annals* to preſerve the reputation of his Order, would clear him from

* *Wadding. Annales Minorum ad A. D.* 1297.

from all suspicion of Heresie; but I suppose the credit of an Inquisitor, having such opportunities to know the truth, so near his own time, and having the examination of many of his followers, is to be relyed on rather than the testimony of one at such a distance, and partial for the honour of his order. Especially, that being considered which *Possevin* saith of *Eymericus*, that most of his accounts of the times a little before his own, were the very same with what was contained in a Manuscript in the *Vatican Library*, both as to order and words; which is thought to have been brought from *Avignon* to *Rome*, where he was made *Inquisitour* General by *Gregory* 11. *A. D.* 1358. But it is not denyed by *Wadding* or others, that the *Beguini* and *Fratricelli*, the *Beguardi* and others were his *followers*; and we shall find so great an agreement in their opinions, that it would be strange they should be accounted the Disciples of any other. *Eymericus* gives this account of them, that in the time of *Clement* 5. there arose in the Province of *Narbonne*, one *Petrus Johannis* a *Franciscan Fryer*, who published by Writing and Preaching a great many Errours and Heresies in the same *Province*, and drew many after him, who had spread themselves over *France*, *Italy*, *Germany*, and other places, and continued in his time, being daily searched for, and condemned by the *Inquisitours*. They all agreed that *their doctrine was from God by immediate inspiration*, *and that all the writings of* Petrus Johannis *were revealed to him from the Lord*, *and that he had*

Possevin. Appar. v. Nicol. Eymeric.

Eymeric. direct. Inquisit. p. 2. quæst. 15.

Error. 36.

declared this to ſome of his Friends; that he was ſo great a Doctor that from the time of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, there have been none greater than he in Learning and Holineſs: and that his writings, theirs only excepted (wherein they fell ſhort of the former *Sect*) *were the moſt uſeful to the Church.*

Of the Doctrines of the ſpiritual Brethren.

§. 10. Their doctrines may be reduced to theſe four heads, 1. Evangelical poverty. 2. Unlawfulneſs of Swearing. 3. The Doctrine of perfection. 4. Oppoſition to the carnal Church. Which being joyned with that greater degree of light, which they ſuppoſed themſelves to have above all the reſt of the world, makes up a *Sect* of *Quakers* after the Order of St. *Francis.*

1. Their Doctrine of *Evangelical poverty*; about which they ſaid, *That our Lord Jeſus Chriſt as man, and his Apoſtles had nothing in proper, or in common, becauſe they were perfectly poor in this world; and that this is perfect Evangelical poverty; but the enjoying any thing, though in common, takes off from the perfection of it; and that the Apoſtles themſelves could not without ſin have any property in any thing, and that it is Hereſie to ſay otherwiſe; therefore the rule of St.* Francis *preſcribing this poverty, was that which Chriſt obſerved and preſcribed to his Apoſtles, and was the ſame with the Goſpel of Chriſt, and therefore whoſoever addes to it, or takes from it* (*be it the Pope himſelf*) *he is a Heretick in ſo doing:* on which account they condemned *John* 22. and all the *Prelates* and *Fryers* for Hereſie, who oppoſed this Doctrine. For we are not to imagine a Doctrine ſo contrary to the

the beloved interests of the *Roman Church*, should escape opposition: nay it was so far from it, that it immediately caused a breach in their own order. For as *Papirius Massonus* well observes from *Petrarch*, *none hate poverty more, than they who profess it most*; and the *Franciscan* order had gotten into their hands goodly possessions, and built magnificent houses, and laid up great provisions of *Corn* and *Wine*; which these followers of *Petrus Johannis* declare against as directly contrary to the rule which they professed, being the *strictest poverty*; which this was as like, as hypocrisie is to sincerity, or St. *Francis* to *Christ*. Upon this a great division happens in the Order: between the Brethren that followed *Petrus Johannis de Oliva*, who were called the *Spiritual men*, and the *Brethren* of the *community*; both parties appeal to *Clement* 5. *Alexander de Alexandria*, *General* of the Order appears in behalf of the *Community*, and *Ubertinus de Casali* on the other side: But the *spiritual Brethren*, fearing hard usage at *Rome*, and from their other *superiours*, choose new ones to themselves, and so make an open *Schisme*. In the *Council* of *Vienna*, *A. D.* 1311. a Decree was made, to declare the *rule* of S. *Francis*; which is extant in the *Canon Law*, under the title of *Clementines*, but this by no means effected a cure; for the people favouring the dissenters in the Province of *Narbon*, they turned out all the *Brethren* of the *community*; and took upon themselves new *habits*, to be distinguished from the rest. During this heat, *Gonsalvus General* of the *Order*, favou-

Papir. Masson. de Episc. Urbis, l. 6. v. Joh 22.

Clementin. l. 5. tit. 11.

Bulæi histor. univers. Paris. Tom. 4. p. 152.

P. 166. favouring the *ſtricter Fryers* dyed at *Paris*, not without ſuſpicion of poiſon from the *looſer Brethren*. *John* 22. being *Pope* reſolves to take a ſeverer courſe with the *diſſenters*, and *A. D.* 1318. imployes the *Inquiſitours* for that end; the fruit of which was, that they brake out into a more open *Schiſme* and choſe one *Henricus de Ceva*, or *de Scna* for their *General*, and kept their *Conventicles* as *John* 22. in his conſtitution, *Sancta Romana*, declares, and every day added to their Sect. And the more *conſtitutions* he publiſhed, the greater oppoſition was made; in ſo much that *Michael de Cæſena*, *Gul. Ockam* and others found out *Hereſies* at laſt in them, and plain contradictions to thoſe of his predeceſſours, eſpecially that of *Nicolaus* 4. which *Bellarmin* confeſſeth cannot in all things be reconciled. No fewer than eighteen errours *Franciſc. Pegna* confeſſeth he was charged with in one *conſtitution*, to which he anſwered in another decretal not publiſhed, in which they found 32 Errours; but *William Ockam* went farther, and charged him with no fewer than 90. A goodly number for an infallible Head or the *Church!* in which there ought to be ſome allowance for humane frailty, as *Benedict* 12. his ſucceſſour pleaded in behalf of *Nicolaus* 4. when he anſwered the objections of the *Fraticelli* againſt *John* 22, as may be ſeen in *Eymericus*. And his anſwers are thought ſo inſufficient by *Pegna*, that he ſaith, *there are ſome doubtful and ſome falſe, which ought not to be paſſed over without animadverſion; and therefore ſolemnly invocates God, that he may be able to*

Bell. de Pontiſ. Rom. l. 4. c. 14.
Fran. Pegna in direct. Inquiſ. comment. 42.
Gul. Ockam Compend. error. Papæ.
Direct. Inquiſit. c. 17. ſ. 5.

to answer them better: and yet this *Benedict* was accounted a *notable Divine*, for a *Pope*; which made the *dissenters*, saith *Pegna*, hate him the more. The substance of his answer which *Pegna* is so much displeased with is, *that though* Nicolaus 4. *had determined contrary to* John 22. *yet the former definition, being contrary to Scripture, ought not to stand.* Thus when *Popes* fall out, the *Scripture* comes by its own; which is, to be the standing rule of all Controversies.

2. They thought it unlawful upon any occasion to swear; this *John* 22. in his decretal, *Gloriosam Ecclesiam*, charges them with, and that those were guilty of mortal sin, and lyable to punishment, who were under the obligation of any Oath whatsoever: the same is reported by *Wadding*, and others, concerning them.

3. The Doctrine of *perfection* was stiffly maintained by them. This *Spondanus* would have to be one of the opinions of the *Beguardi*, whom he distinguishes from the *Beguini*; but not only *Eymericus* and *Pegna* make them to be the same, but *John* 22. in the *Extravagant Sancta Romana* condemns both together, as the title is in *Eymericus*; and in the body of it, it appears that they went under divers names in several places, being sometimes called *Fraticelli*, sometimes *Fratres de pœnitentia*, sometimes *Fratres de paupere vitâ*, sometimes *Bizochi*, sometimes *Begbini* and sometimes *Beguardi*; which latter seems to be the name that they were known in *Germany* most by. *Eymericus* speaking of *Petrus Olerii* and *Bononatus*, two

Spondan. Annales Eccles. A. D. 1311. *n.* 7.

Eymeric. p. 2. *q.* 11.

of

of the *Begardi* in *Spain*, that were burnt for their Heresie by the *Inquisitour* and *Bishop* of *Barcelona*, saith, that they held the opinion mentioned before concerning *Evangelical poverty*, which *Spondanus* thinks peculiar to the *Beguini*. About perfection their opinions were these, as *Alvarus Pelagius*, *Joh. Turrecremata*, *Ezovius*, *Spondanus*, and *Raynaldus* all agree, *that a man in this life may attain to so great perfection, as to live without sin; that a man who hath attained to such a degree, is above ordinances*, i. e. *he need not fast and pray as others do; that, such as are perfect, have the spirit of liberty, and are not subject to any humane Ordinances, either of Church, or State: That, every intellectual Being hath enough within it self to make it happy*, or a light within; *so that it doth not need any external light of Glory, in order thereto.* That, *to live in the exercise of moral vertues, is an argument of a State of imperfection*; and that, *one truly perfect is above them.* From hence *they accounted all actions, which were designed to satisfie natural inclinations, to be indifferent; and so looked on unclean mixtures as no sins. Alvarus* saith, he saw one of them who was a *German*, and seemed a very *spiritual man*, in a very mean habit and looking sowrely with tears in his eyes, and full of raptures; and thought himself a *Contemplator* and a *Taster*; Names not yet taken up, by any *Fanaticks* among us. And to let others understand, how easily men were imposed upon by *visions* and *raptures* among them; he saith, *that he knew a woman, who was afterwards known to be naught, that had raptures*

Alvarus de planctu Eccles. l. 2. c. 52.
Tur. cremata Sum. l 4 c. 36. part. 2.
Ezov. Annal. A. D. 1309. n. 12.
Spondan. Annal. A. D. 1311. n. 7.
Raynald. Annal. A. D. 1312. n. 17.
Alvarus l. 2. c 46. p. 87.

ratures at her pleasure, whom he had honoured as a Saint himself, and the very ground she stood on; and not only he, but many others, even Prelats and Cardinals too: by which he saw evidently how easily the Devil, could transform himself into an Angel of Light; and after saith of the Beguinæ, that under the shew of sanctity they committed many vile things. A strange instance of the impostures of one of the *Beguinæ*, who gained a great reputation for sanctity by her constancy and devotion at prayers, her pretending to raptures and extasies wherein her soul was carried to Heaven, her long fastings whereby she imposed upon the *Bishop*, the *Fryers*, and all the people to so great a degree that the *Bishop* was about building a *Church* on purpose to lay her in, that all comers might behold her who led such an *Angelical* life; and how accidentally the imposture was discovered, to the great dissatisfaction of them all, but especially the *Bishop*, is at large related by *Richerius*. *Richerii Chronic. Senonens. l. 4. cap. 18.*

4. But notwithstanding all this, they had a mighty zeal against the *carnal Church*; and *called all those blind, who were not of their way*, as *Eymericus* saith of them; in these matters they followed *Petrus Johannis*, of whose opinions about the *Church* we have already spoken; any that suffered among them, were cryed up as *Martyrs*; and four of the *Brethren* suffering at *Marseilles A. D. 1316.* they said *they were so far from suffering as Hereticks, that they were as good Martyrs as St.* Laurence, *or* Vincentius; that *Christ was spiritually Crucified in them*, that *all who approved or consented to their death, Pope, Prelats* *Eymeric. p. 2. q. 15. err. 41. Error. 20.*

Prelats or others were all Hereticks for it; and loſt all right of governing the Church, or adminiſtring Sacraments; and are out of the Church; and Q.16.ſ.2. *therefore not in a ſtate of Salvation, and they only are the true Church.* Theſe are the chief of their *doctrines*, although *Eymericus* reckons up no fewer than fifty five Errours and Hereſies among them. And notwithſtanding all the care uſed by *Popes* and *Inquiſitours* againſt them, in the time of *Clement* 5. *John* 22. *Benedict* 12. *Clement* 6. *Innocent* 6. and afterwards, they not only continued, but ſpread themſelves ſtill further. *John Gerſon*, who lived in the beginning of the next Century, mentions not only the doctrines of the *everlaſting Goſpel*, but thoſe of the *Begardi*, the ſubſtance of which he ſaith, *that a perfect ſoul being reduced to God, loſeth its own will, ſo that it hath no other will but the divine will, which it had from eternity in that Ideal being which it had in God: which being ſuppoſed, they ſay, they may do any thing which their affection puts them upon, without ſin; becauſe they have no will of their own.* The way of renouncing their own will was ſomewhat different, he tells us; for the more cunning pretended to do it only to *God*; but theſe prevailed upon the other, to renounce their own wills before them; which when they had done, they told them they could now ſin no longer: and ſo did what they pleaſed together. Under which pretext of renouncing their own wills, all manner of wickedneſs was committed among them. Neither were they only in *France*, *Italy*, *Sicily* and *Germany*, but they

Gerſon. opir. To.1.p.1. pag.574.

they prevailed much in *Spain* too: for in the time of *Benedict* 12, in *Catalonia* there were many *Beguardi* saith *Eymericus*, the chief of whom was *Fryer Bonanatus* who was burnt for his Heresie; in the time of *Clement* 6. there arose many of them in the *Province* of *Valencia*, whose leader was *Jacobus Justi*, and was therefore immured and so dyed. In the time of *Innocent* 6. *Urban* 5. *Gregory* 11. appeared in *Catalonia*, one *Arnoldus Montanerius*, who publickly Preached for nineteen years together, the opinions of the *Begardi* about *poverty*, and added these of his own, that *no one can be damned who wears the habit of St.* Francis; *that St.* Francis *once a year goes down into Purgatory, and thence draws the souls of all that have been of his order, and carries them to Paradise.* These we have from *Eymericus*, who saith that by order of *Urban* 5. and *Greg.* 11. he sate as *Inquisitour* upon him. And, lest we should think this *Sect* inconsiderable among them, *Ludovicus de Paramo*, the *Inquisitour* of *Sicily*, declares, that *the Fratricelli, carrying an appearance of Sanctity with great poverty drew the hearts of all men to them, and drove* John 22. *into great straights, and by the Schisme they raised, gave a great disturbance to the whole Church.* Neither was it of any short continuance, if we *consider* the fundamental principles of this Sect, which were *immediate revelations, renouncing property*, and *liberty of actions*: for so it began with *Almerick* at *Paris*, and we have seen how much afterwards promoted by the *Mendicant Fryers*; and especially by those who called

Eymeric. p. 2. q. 11. f. 5.

Lud. de Paramo de orig. sanctæ Inquis. l. 2. tit. 3. cap. 4. n. 23.

called themselves of the *third Order* of St. *Francis*, and pretended to far greater strictness as to their rule than others: on which account *Celestine* 5. *A. D.* 1294. gave them first *liberty to separate themselves* from the *Community*, which was afterwards pleaded by the *Fraticelli*, against *Clement* 5. and *John* 22.

Spondan. Annales A.D.1294. n. 9. Balæ histor. universit. Paris. Tom. 3. p. 510.

§. 11. But besides these who before were of this order, others took up the same way and opinions, which were never originally of it; as the followers of *Geraldus Segarelli*, and *Dulcinus*, in *Italy*, who are called *Fratricelli* by *Platina*, by others *Pseudo-Apostolici* and *Dulcinistæ*. *Spondanus* confesseth those in *Italy*, who were the followers of one *Hermanus* of *Ferrara*, to be the same with the *Fraticelli* and *Beguini*; whose body saith *Prateolus*, *after he had been twenty years worshipped for a Saint, was by the command of* Boniface 8. *taken up and burnt for an Heretick*: *Ludovicus de Paramo* saith that it was *thirty years after, he had been publickly worshipped by the people of* Ferrara; and he reckons up this, as one of the great blessings which comes by the *Inquisition*; *that they are thereby undeceived in many whom they worship for Saints*, of which he gives several other instances. But the burning of *Hermanus* bones, did not extinguish the Sect of *Fraticelli* there; the only effect of this severity was, that they grew more numerous and bold, as *Prateolus* and *Spondanus* confess. They kept their *Conventicles* more frequently, and spread the further; insomuch that great multitudes of people fell in with them: Among whom as their chief leaders were

Of the continuance of this Sect.

Platina in vit. Clem. 5. Spondan. Annales. A.D.1297. n.9. Prateolus de hæres. l.8. v. Herman. Paramo de orig. inquisit. l 2. tit. 3. c.4. v.38.

were several of the Order of S. *Francis*, as *Spondanus* proves from the *Extravagant Sancta Romana* of *John* 22. And of the same Sect were the *Pseudo-Apostolici*, whose chief leaders were *Geraldus Segarelli* and *Dulcinus* one of his Disciples; the one of *Parma*, the other of *Novara*: these *filled all the Countrey thereabouts with their error*, saith *Eymericus*; and made an *Independent Congregation among themselves*, which acknowled *obedience* and *subjection*, as he adds, *to none but God himself*; and said that they followed the *Apostolical rule*, in a very singular manner. This *Geraldus*, saith *Paramo*, *and his followers*, *by a shew of extraordinary sanctity*, *drew many to their party*: but *Frian Salimbenus* (in a *Manuscript* seen by *Pegna*, in the *Library* of *Cardinal Savelli* at *Rome*) being himself a *Franciscan*, gives this account of him, whom he calls *Gherardinus Segalellus*; that being desirous to be admitted into their Order, he was refused by them; after which he spent some time in the *Franciscans* Church, where observing the pictures of the *Apostles*, and the habit they were drawn in, he put himself as exactly as he could into the very same habit; and having sold his house, and received the money for it, he distributed it all among the people; and afterwards got a Companion, who was a servant to the *Franciscans*: but by degrees their number increased, so that in a short time *they spread over many Cities in* Italy: *and from thence were dispersed over almost all* Europe: *They went up and down in the streets*, saith *Eymericus*, *Preaching Repentance with a white Mantel*,

Direct. Inquis. p. 2. q. 12.

Paramo l. 2. tit. 3. c. 4. n. 19.

Pegn. not. in direct. p. 2. q. 12.

tel, a white Coat, and long hair, barefoot and bareheaded, and what they eat, was publickly in the streets, and only what was given to them: after forty years in which they mightily prevailed, *Boniface* 8. caused *Gerald* to be taken and burnt; upon this *Dulcinus* with six thousand of his Companions retired into the *Alps*, where they increased so much, saith *Pegna*, that Clement 5. was forced to send a Croisado against them: where they starved a great part of them; but *Dulcinus* and his Wife *Margareta*, as *Patreolus* calls her, were taken and burnt. *It is not credible,* saith *Bzovius*, *how long they endured upon the* Alps, *all extremities of hunger and cold, rather than they would yield to their Adversaries.* But notwithstanding all the endeavours could be used, they could not wholly extinguish that Sect, saith *Prateolus*; but the remainders of it were still left in the Mountains, about *Trent*, and continued to his time, which was about *A. D.* 1560. These were of the same opinions with the *Fratricelli* before mentioned, as to the *Roman Church*; that by reason of the wickedness of the *Clergy* and *Religious Orders*, it was a *reprobate Church*, and the *Whore of Babylon*; but being no more content with this, than the greatest Fanaticks of our *Age*, they pretended to great things themselves, that *they were the only Spiritual Congregation, sent, and chosen out by God to bear testimony to his truth, in the last ages; and that they, and only they, had the power which S.* Peter *had*; that *Geraldus Segarelli*, *was a plant of Gods own planting, growing up from the root of faith; by whom God began the work of*

Bzov. Annales A.D. 1309. n. 13.

Prateolus de her. l. 4. v. Dulcinus.

Refor-

Reformation of his Church, to the purity, perfection, life, state and poverty of the primitive Church, in that state wherein Christ committed his Church to S. Peter. *That they only are the Church of God, and in that perfection wherein the Apostles were, and therefore are bound to live in subjection to none, because their rule which was immediately from Christ, is free, and hath the greatest perfection; that no one can be saved, who is not of their Order; that it is a sign any one is in a state of damnation, to persecute them: that all the Popes from* Sylvester *downward, and all the Prelates, were Impostors and Deceivers, excepting only* Celestine 5. *who renounced his Popedom, and gave leave to the Spiritual Brotherhood to separate from the rest in the* Franciscan *Order. That the Orders of Clergy and Religion are dangerous to the Church. That no laymen ought to pay any tythes to Priest or Prelat, who lives not in the same perfection and poverty which the Apostles did. That it was as well to Worship God in Woods or Stables, or Barns, as in consecrated Churches: That it was unlawful for Christians to swear at all,* saith *Prateolus*; *or never but in case of the Articles of faith, or the Divine commands,* say, *Turrecremata* and *Eymericus*; *but in all other cases, it was lawful to use equivocations and mental reservations, and to deny their Sect with their mouths, as long as they kept true to them in their hearts. That nothing was unlawful which was done out of a principle of Love: and that all things, in the worst sense, were to be common among them; and therefore they are charged with allowing and*

practising promiscuous mixtures among themselves, if their Adversaries do not charge them as unjustly in this point, as the *Primitive Christians* were charged by the Heathen. This is the sum of their Principles and practices, as they are reported by *Turretcremata, Eymericus, Prateolus, Spondanus, Raynaldus,* and others. But that which is still observable to our purpose is, that these were looked on as a sort of *Friers* in the *Roman Church*; for when *Honorius* 4. condemned them by his *Bull*, extant in *Eymericus*, he doth it upon this account, that *they were a sort of* Mendicant *Friers not approved by the Roman See, whereas* Greg. 10. *in the Council of* Lyons *had absolutely forbid all Orders of* Mendicants *after the* Lateran *Council, that should not receive express confirmation from the Pope; but his Holiness was informed, that some who called themselves of the Apostolical Order, had since that time assumed to themselves a new habit of Religion, without due applications being made to his See; and a great number of these went up and down, as Mendicants, into many parts of the world, doing unseemly things to their own peril and the scandal of others; especially some among them being guilty of Heresie: therefore all Ecclesiastical Officers are required, to admonish and compel them to lay down their habits, and to enter themselves among some of the approved Religious Orders; and in case of refusal they ought to proceed judicially against them, and to deliver them over to the Secular power.* By which we understand the true ground of the quarrel against them; *viz.*

not

Turretcremata Sum. de Eccles. l. 4. p. 2. c. 37. Eymeric. p. 2. q. 12. Prateolus l. 14. n. 41. Spondan. A.D. 1370. n. 16. Raynald. A.D. 1311. n. 66. Naucler. Gen. 44. p. 985. Gaultieri Chronol. sec. 1300. c. 8.

not yielding ſubjection enough to the *Roman See*, and how eaſily all their Blaſphemies and Villanies might be forgiven, if they entred themſelves into any of the approved *Religious Orders*.

§. 12. As we ſee all the care uſed could not root out this Sect wholly, but the remainders of them continued in ſome of the *Mountains of Italy*; ſo I am very much miſtaken if the *Alumbrado's* in *Spain*, or the *Sect* of *Illuminati*, were any other than a remainder of the *Begini* and *Fraticelli* whom we obſerved before to have got footing there. *Spondanus* indeed and ſome others from him, ſay, *they were deteſted in the Dioceſſes* of Sevil *and* Cadiz, A. D. 1623. *and were condemned by* Andreas Pachecus, *the general Inquiſitor in* Spain, *in twenty ſix Articles, and the ſeven chief of them were burnt: but withall* he ſaith, *they were not ſo much a new Sect, as a renewal of an old one with ſome additions.* Nay we meet with the very ſame name of the *Sect*, long before that: For *Ludovicus de Paramo* ſaith, that *ſeveral Prieſts were taken, by order of the Inquiſition, in the Town of* Lerena; *who under pretence of extraordinary illumination from God, did gain upon the people, and ſpread dangerous opinions among them.* And afterwards he particularly deſcribes them, under the names of the *Illuminati*, by their *pride* and *diſobedience* to their *Superiors*, by their *obſtinate adhering to their Illuſions*, and *indulging themſelves in their ſenſual luſts*; all which fully agree to the Character already given of the *Fraticelli*, and *Begardi*. For the firſt he ſaith, *they chuſe*

Of the *Alumbrado's* in *Spain*.

Spondan. Annales. A.D. 1623. n. 7.

Lud de Paramo de origine Inquiſit. l. 2. tit. 3. c. 5. n. 15.

Lib. 3. q. 5. n. 186, &c.

rather to be broken in pieces, than give obedience to their Biſhops; for the ſecond he proves, *that as long as they gave way to ſenſual luſts, their illumination could not be from God; for they who would ſleep in the Divine light*, as he ſpeaks, *muſt have their eye-lids ſhut as to all worldly vanities and pleaſures*; *therefore we ought to ſhun ſuch illuminated, or rather blind perſons, who transform themſelves into Angels of light, ſpreading divers Doctrines and Revelations which they have*; of whom he interprets the *Epiſtle of S. Jude*. By all that hath been ſaid, this Sect ſeems to be nothing elſe but *Gnoſticiſm*, revived under new ſhapes and names; and with a difference of opinions, ſuitable to the age wherein it appeared. *Spondanus* gives this account of the opinions and practices of the modern *Alumbrado's*, that *under a pretence of mental Prayer and Divine contemplation, and union with God; they deſpiſed the uſe of Sacraments, Preaching the Word of God, and all holy exerciſes; and did extol the other ſo highly, that they ſaid theſe things would not be ſins in them, which were ſo in others, and by this means committed all impurities.* Of this Sect *Ignatius Loyola* was vehemently ſuſpected to be, and upon that account was caſt into Priſon by the *Inquiſition* in *Spain*. Which *Maffeius* himſelf doth not deny, *that it was upon the account of the* Illuminati, *and his Enthuſiaſtical Preaching in the Streets*, that he was queſtioned. But *Melchior Canus* that learned *Biſhop* of the *Canaries* puts the matter out of diſpute, for in a diſcourſe of his *concerning the foundation of the Society of Jeſus*, preſerved en-

N. 211.

N. 238.

Maffeius in vit. Ignatii l. 1. cap. 17.

tire

tire in the hands of *Dominicus Canus Bishop* of *Cadiz* his Nephew, and publisht in part by *Schioppus*, he saith, *that the General of that Order was one* Innico *who fled out of* Spain, *lest he should be laid hold on by the Inquisition, being suspected for the Heresie of the* Illuminati; *and coming to* Rome, *he desired to be judged by the Pope, where no accuser appearing he was absolved.* He gives him the Character of a *vain man*; for, *being once in his company at* Rome, *he presently without any occasion began to boast of his righteousness, and the unjust persecution he had suffered in* Spain: *and spake many and great things of the Revelations he had from God, without any necessity; upon which account he saith, he believed not any thing at all concerning them. Another day,* he adds, *when he went to dine with him, he commended one of his Brethren for a great Saint, who coming into the room where they were, he presently suspected the man to be mad: and when he talked with him about matters of Religion, he answered heretically, not out of design, but because he was an Ideot, a rude, ignorant fellow.* Ignatius *being confounded at this, said he was no Heretick, but a Fool; but he believed he had some lucid intervals; and at that time by reason of the conjunction of the Moon, he was not a very sound Catholick.* See from what *Man*, the *Jesuits* derive the infallibility of their faith! But although *Canus* was a person of more learning and judgement than a thousand *Ignatius*'s; yet the *Jesuits* decry him as very partial against them: for *Orlandinus*, in his *History of the Society*, complains of him *as one of the bitterest enemies* they

Schiopp. Infam. Famil. p. 62.

Orlandin. hist. Societ. Jesu. l. 8. n. 46.

they had in the beginning of their Society; for he every where ſet them forth as the *Forerunners* of *Antichriſt*, and explained the Prophecy of them, concerning the men *that ſhould be in the laſt times.* Wherein it is ſaid, *Men ſhall be lovers of themſelves, covetous, boaſters, blaſphemers,* &c. *Traytors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleaſures, more than lovers of God, having a form of Godlineſs, but denying the power thereof: For of this ſort are they which creep into houſes, and lead captive ſilly women laden with ſins, led away with divers luſts,* &c. The ſame thing (ſaith *Orlandinus* and truly) was charged upon *the Orders of the* Dominicans *and* Franciſcans, *as well as them:* and we ſhall not quarrel with them, which Order of them all hath the greateſt ſhare in the accompliſhment of this Prophecy.

2 Tim. 3 1. to v. 8.

The Jeſuits Order founded in Fanaticiſm

§. 13. That which is our preſent buſineſs, is to ſhew that this Order was inſtituted as the other were, upon the credit of *Viſions* and *Revelations*; for *Ignatius* was certainly as *Ignorant* and *Enthuſiaſtical* as S. *Francis* himſelf; and to prove this, I ſhall only make uſe of thoſe of his own Order, who have writ his life (*Maffeius*, *Orlandinus* and *Ribadeneira*) and purſue it no farther than the inſtitution of the Order, as I have done with the other. The firſt remarkable thing in him was, that he was converted by reading the *Legends* of the *Saints*, as *Don Quixot* began his *Errantry* by reading *the old Romances*: I wonder how *Ignatius* did to read them, for *Maffeius* deſcribes him, *as one that had hardly ever learnt his letters*:

ters: but it is possible St. *Peter* taught him, for they all write that St. Peter *appeared to him, before he was so far recovered as to be able to read.* But his Country-man was not more moved with the adventures of former *Knights*, than *Ignatius* was with the stories of St. *Dominick* and St. *Francis*; for these, *Maffeius* tells us, did *particularly work upon him:* in so much that before he took up a firm resolution of *Religious Errantry*, he would put cases to himself of the difficult *Adventures* of those two *illustrious Heroes*; and found himself to have mettle enough, to *undertake any of them:* and therefore in a fit of zeal, one night *he gets out of his bed, and fell down upon his knees, before an Image of the B. Virgin, and in that posture vowed himself* her *Knight.* Which is a circumstance so considerable, I admire that *Maffeius* omits it; as he doth likewise *the strange noise in the house, the trembling of the room, and the breaking of the glass windows that time:* an argument, saith *Orlandinus*, that the *Devil then took his leave of him*; although there be some reason to doubt it. After this, the *V. Mary* appeared to him with a great deal of glory, with her Child in her lap, (and all this while, for the vision continued for some time, he thought himself awake) by which sight he was hugely animated for all his future adventures. The first whereof was to a place of great devotion to the *B. Virgin*, called *Montserrat*; and in the way thither, he was like to have begun his first adventure

Ribadeneira vit. Ignat. c. 1.

Ribadeneira c. 1. Orlandin. hist. l. 1. n. 12.

adventure with a *Moore*, who allowed the *B. Virgin* to have been ſo till her delivery, but would not yield it afterwards; at which *Ignatius*, conſidering whoſe *Knight* he was, began to be ſo inraged, that he thought it neceſſary to revenge her quarrel upon him; but diſputing with himſelf what to do, and the *Moore* being gone another way, he leaves the cauſe to the wiſdom of the *Mule*, and puts the Reines in his neck, that if he took the *Moores* way at the parting of the two wayes he would have his life; but the good *Mule* underſtanding his Riders mind, left the beaten road, and went on to *Montſerrat*: where a remarkable Ceremony was performed by him; for as *Orlandinus* and *Maffeius* expreſly ſay, Ignatius *having read in Books of Chivalry, that the ancient Knights at their firſt entring upon that honourable imployment, were wont to watch all night in their arms*, he thought it fit to begin his *Errantry* in the ſame manner; he therefore hangs up his *Sword* and *Dagger*, before the *Altar* of the *B. Virgin*, and puts on his habiliments; but inſtead of his ſhining Armour, he had gotten a long *Coat* of Sack-cloth, with a cord about it, at which he hangs his bottle for water; and inſtead of his *Lance*, a plain Crab-tree ſtaffe, with a wicker ſhooe upon one foot, and the other naked; having no *Morrion* on his head, but expoſed that to the violence of the weather. All theſe habiliments (having procured them by the way,) he hung at the pummel of his Saddle, when he entred the *Town*, ſaith *Maffeius*, (for fear the people ſhould think him in his wits)

Orlandin. hiſt. l. 1. n. 18.

Maffei. l. 1. c. 4.

Maffeius l. 1. c. 3.

wits) but he puts them not on, till he came to the sacred place where he was, by the *Laws of Chivalry*, to watch in them; and so he did, say they, *sometimes standing, sometimes kneeling, and devoting himself with all his might to the service of the B. Virgin.* Which having done, *early the next morning* (for that is a necessary circumstance too in the adventures of Chivalry) *away he goes for Manresa*; where he takes up his lodging in the *Town-Hospital*, and lets his Haire and Nailes grow, and beggs from door to door (and yet fasted six dayes in the week) he whipps himself thrice a day, was seven houres every day in vocal prayer, lay upon the bare ground, and all to prepare himself for his *adventures* to *Jerusalem*. Which sort of life growing very uneasie to him, he was once near, saith *Maffeius*, throwing himself out of a Window, to put an end to it; but *God* (having designed his order, for a further punishment to the world) not permitting that; not long after, he had such clear *divine revelations*, that in a moment of time, saith *Maffeius*, he understood the greatest mysteries of *Religion*, and the most subtle speculations in *Philosophy* (especially the way of *Gods* making the World, was made clear to him, but not so as he could express it to others) which other men cannot attain to with the hardest study and pains. In one of his Visions, saith *Orlandinus*, while he was repeating the Horary Prayers of the *B. Virgin*, he saw the *B. Trinity*, as plainly as we do one another, under *a corporeal representation*; and was so full of joy at it, that he could not hold

Maffeius l. 1. c. 6.

c. 7.

Orland. l. 1. n. 27.

hold weeping before all the people; and was so enlightned by it, that although he was yet very ignorant, he began to write a Book *of the glorie of the B. Trinity*. In one of his extasies, he continued *eight dayes*; in which it is probable, saith the same Author, he saw *the frame and model of the Society of Jesuits*. A Blessed sight! if he saw all the consequences of it too. After this, in order to his voyage to *Hierusalem*, away he goes for *Barcelona*; where *Elizabeth Rosella* espying him at Church sitting among the Boyes, she saw a great shining about his mouth, and heard a voice within her, which bid her call that man to her house. While he was in *Italy*, in his way to *Hierusalem*, Christ appeared to him again at *Padua*, as he was wont to do at *Manresa*; at *Venice*, one of the Senatours had a vision concerning him, checking him for lying in so much state, while that holy man *Ignatius* lay in the open aire. Visions were grown so familiar with him now, that it is to no purpose to recount those, which he had at *Hierusalem*, and elsewhere. In his return through *Italy*, the *Spanish* Souldiers used him hardly, taking him for a Spy, and carryed him to their Commander; now, saith *Orlandinus*, *it had been his custome, not to give men any titles of respect, but to call them only by their common names; and he questioned a little with himself, whether he ought to break that custome, now he was to appear before the Commander; and resolves it in the Negative, because to do it proceeded from too great fear of men: therefore being brought befor him, he*

N. 28.

N. 32.

Ribadeneira c. 4.

Orland. l. 1. n. 34.

N. 35.

N. 44.

gives

gives him no testimony of respect either in his words or actions; and particularly (both *Maffeius* and *Orlandinus* testifie) *he would not put off his Hat to him.* By which we understand, who was the first Founder of that *Fanatick* Sect among us, which is distinguished so much from others, by denying *common civilities* to men. Upon this, the Commander severely rebuked the Souldiers, for bringing a *mad man* to him; at which they were so enraged, that he might have saved himself the labour of whipping himself that day, they doing him that office very effectually. Being returned to *Barcelona*, at thirty three years of *Age*, he begins to learn his *Grammar*; to enable him, I suppose, to express those *mysteries* of *Religion* and *Philosophy* which he understood so clearly by Revelation: but as *Maffeius* observes, he could not have *Amo* in his mouth, but his mind was carryed he knew not whither, and was so full of *visions* all that while, that he could not remember one word that he learnt; upon which he beggs his *Master*, falling in great humility at his feet (having it seems more reverence for him, than he had for the *Spanish Officer*), that he would tye him punctually as he did the Boys to his Lessons; and if he could not say them, that he might be *whipt* as they were. But as dull as he was at his Book, he had so great *elevations* in his *Prayers*, that (if we believe him) one *John Pascual*, saith *Orlandinus*, saw him raised up from the ground in a dark night; but that being a suspicious circumstance, he addes that the

Maff. c. 16.

Maff. l. 1. c. 16.

Orland. hist. l. 1. n. 47.

N. 49.

room

room at the same time was filled with a great light. Having stayed out his two years at *School* in *Barcelona*, to the *University* he goes, where he privately studies *Logick*, *Physicks*, and *Divinity* together; to very little purpose, as *Maffeius* confesseth; and in the mean time, *Preaches, and Beggs in the Streets.* Here he was several times under examination by the Inquisition, and once imprisoned for forty one dayes; out of which he was not dismissed, till they had commanded him not to Discourse of *Divinity* again, till he had studied four years, and to wear the same *habit* with other *Students*. Upon this he removes to *Salamanca*, where he finds no kinder entertainment, being put into chains in the *Dungeon* and strictly examined; For here he follows his former course; he and his companions in an *Enthusiastical* manner (being meer *lay-men*, as *Maffeius* acknowledgeth) *going up and down the Streets, Preaching in all places, and to all sorts of persons*; and being examined by the *Sub-prior* of the *Dominicans*, what *Studies* they followed, *Ignatius* very fairly confessed the truth, that they were *unlearned*. He then asked him, why they took upon them to Preach; *Ignatius* very subtilly told him, they did not *Preach*; they did only *hold forth* to the people in a familiar manner, concerning *vertue* and *vice*; and thereby endeavoured to bring them to the hatred of one and love of the other. The *Sub-prior* told him, this was Preaching; which no one could pretend to do, but either by learning, or immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost;

Maffei. l. 1. c. 17.
Orland. l. 1. n. 56.
N. 61.
Maffei. l. 1. c. 17.

Ghost; and since you do not pretend to learning, you must pretend to be inspired. Here *Ignatius* finding himself caught; resolutely denyed to give him any answer, unless he were legally impowred to examine him. *Say you so*, said the *Dominican?* I will take care of that suddenly: So they were three dayes kept in the *Convent*, and after that by order of the *Bishop of Salamanca*, were committed to close Prison; where he Preached to the people with great zeal, who now flocked in great numbers to him, and gloried as much in his sufferings, and talked at the same rate, that the Ring-leaders of the *Quakers* are wont to do among us: And just with the same resolution; for when the rest of the Prisoners made their escape, by the negligence of the keepers, *Ignatius* and his companions would not stirr: When they were called to answer, *Ignatius* Preached at large upon several points of Divinity to them, under pretence of answering questions. After twenty two dayes, promising to submit themselves to the judgement of the *Church*, they are dismissed; but with a charge, in four years time not to meddle with nice Cases of Conscience; which *Ignatius* took with so much indignation, that he had a present impulse upon his mind to be gone; and no consideration whatever could hinder him, but away he must go to *Paris*, to see if he could meet with any better success there. And accordingly he begins his journey, driving all his learning before him, which was an *Asse laden with Books*, as *Maffeius* relates; and so reaches *Barcelona*, and afterwards,

Maffei. l. 1. c. 18.

afterwards arrived safe at *Paris*. Where being sensible of his own ignorance and dulness, he resolves to ply his Book better; and to that end, enters himself among the Boyes in the *School*, and begins his *Grammar* again. A sad case! that after two years *Schooling* at *Barcelona*, having been at two *Universities* in *Spain*, and having had so many *revelations*, he should be yet so great a *Dunce*, that he could not tell the rules of *Grammar*. Now he finds it necessary to *pray* and *whip* less, and to *study* more. Here he meets with so cold a reception, that Hospitals Begging, help from Countrey men, were all little enough to keep him at first from *starving*; but however, after eighteen months, spent in learning a little *Latin*, he applyes himself to *Philosophy*; but the *Enthusiastick* heat of his brain was so great, that he had much adoe to keep his mind to it; yet at last he obtained his Degree in *Philosophy*, after three years and a half study, or at least so much time spent there. Then he goes to the *Dominican School*, to learn *Divinity*; where he got *just enough, to keep him from being a Heretick*; for so much *Maffeius* his words imply. All this while, his *Enthusiastick head* was full of *projects*, in order to the drawing *Disciples* to himself; that he might, in imitation of former *Heroes*, Found a *new order*: For this it is apparent he aimed at, and for the sake of this he went through so many difficulties, and pretended so much to *Enthusiasm*, without which he knew his design could not be compassed. *Orlandinus* therefore tells us, that being at

Orlandin. hist. Soc. Jes. l. 1. n. 66.

Antwerp,

Antwerp, (as he uſed to make excurſions ſometimes from *Paris*, to beg a ſubſiſtence) being in a company of Merchants, he looked ſtedfaſtly upon a young Merchant, and (not knowing what effect ſuch words might have upon him afterwards) he called him aſide, and told him, *he ought to thank God, who had choſen him to build a Colledge for the Society of Jeſus, in his own Countrey.* By which it is plain, what he deſigned at that time, before he had yet formed any thing like a *Society*; and the ſame Author would have men believe, that *God* had then revealed it to him, that he ſhould found that *Society*; otherwiſe, he ſaith well, *no man would have taken ſo much pains as he did, unleſs he had ſuch a thing in his head.* During his abode at *Paris*, he had prevailed upon three *Students*; and the firſt thing he perſwaded them to, was to give away all that they had and their *Books* too, and to beg their bread; which cauſed a great heat in the *Univerſity*, he being ſuſpected to have made them mad, and by force they took them away, from the *Hoſpital*, whither he had drawn them. I omit his flying, or rather being carryed, as it were in a rapture, from *Paris* to *Rouen*, and the joy and extatick expreſſions he had in it; his ſtanding up in dirt and mire to the neck, to repreſent to his companion the *filthineſs of the ſin he lived in*; his ſo narrowly eſcaping being publickly *whipt* in the Univerſity for ſeducing the *Students*, that *Orlandinus* makes it almoſt a Miracle: But we are now to take notice, that his deſign being to form a *Society*; he

Orland. n.68,69.

Nat.

Maffeius l.1. c.21. & Laud. n.75.

had, for that purpose, used himself to all the arts of *insinuation* imaginable; accommodating himself to the humours of the persons he had to do with, endeavouring to oblige all men with expressions of the greatest kindness, bearing all affronts with a wonderful dissimulation, as *Maffeius* describes him. By these arts he labours, to get some of the most hopeful *Students* in the University to him; and at last prevailes upon nine, to joyne with him: he studies their humours and applies himself accordingly; not acquainting them at first with his design, but by degrees prepares them for it: Among them, *N.84.* *Xaverius* at first laughed at him, and despised him, but was at last won by his obsequiousness, flattery, and insinuation. And finding his former Disciples soon grew weary of him and forsook him, he resolves to tye these faster; and to that end, appoints a meeting in a *Church*, dedicated to the *B. Virgin*, in the *Suburbs* of *Paris*; where they all solemnly vow, before receiving the *Eucharist* (none but themselves being present) either to go to *Jerusalem*, or to offer themselves to the *Popes* service; which was done *A. D.* 1534. upon the day of *Assumption* of the *B. Virgin*, to whose *Patronage* they particularly devoted themselves. After this, *Ignatius* fearing their relapse, kept them together as much as might be, and used all means to prevent any differences happening among them, having now gotten persons to his mind; *N96.* and for fear the Friends of some of his chief confidents in *Spain* should take them off, he offers to go himself, and dispatch their business for

for them. In his return to *Spain*, he observes his former course of *Preaching* and *Begging*; and was followed by such a multitude of people, that he was fain to Preach in the *Fields*, where (which deserves admiration, in so weak and mortified a man) though he could not raise his voice, yet it was heard distinctly above *a quarter of a mile*, say *Orlandinus* and *Ribadeneira*; but *Maffeius* more prudently omits it. But he helps us with as good a passage, instead of it; *Ignatius* was prevailed upon now by his Disciples, to make use of a *horse*, in his journey to *Spain*; which when he was come thither, he left to an *Hospital*, where the people looked on him with so much reverence, that no man durst use him afterwards; but, as a *consecrated horse*, he was preserved in ease and good pasture, all his life time. At *Venice*, at the time appointed, his companions meet him, where they debate their voyage to *Hierusalem*; and their custome, *Orlandinus*, saith, was this; *in any matter of debate, they were to joyne together in Prayer; and after seeking God, what opinion the most were of that they resolve upon; which they observed*, saith he, till the self-denying *Ignatius*, was, after much *seeking God* in their way, made the *General*; and then *his Will was to rule them:* after a years stay about *Venice* (their courage being now cooled, as to *Hierusalem*) in which time *Ignatius*, and the rest that were yet *Lay-men*, entred into *Orders*; they determine to go to *Rome*, and submit themselves wholly to the *Popes* pleasure: and in the mean time, wander about the Countrey, Preaching in the *Streets* and *Market-places*, and making use of the

Maffeius l. 2. cap. 1.

Orlandin. l. 1. n. 116. Ribadeneir. c. 8.

Maff. l. 2. c. 1.

Orland. l. n. 111.

Maff. l. 2. c. 4.

Bulks of *Shops* for their *Pulpits*; and they *invited the people to hear them*, ſaith *Maffeius*, *with a loud voice and whirling their Caps over their heads*; and though few underſtood them, being ſtrangers, yet all admired and commended them; and no doubt they converted many, as their followers have done, from the uſe of Laces and Ribbands. All this while, ſince *Ignatius* began to have any ſmattering of Learning, we read little of his *viſions* and *revelations*; but the time coming near, that he hoped for a confirmation of his Order from the *Pope*, now ſaith *Maffeius*, he began to have them again as frequently as he had at *Manreſa* (which in a kind of a *religious jeſt*, he ſaith, he was wont to call his *primitive Church*) and ſuch as much exceeded the former: for what he now ſaw, being above humane nature, cannot be expreſſed; only one *Viſion* did him a great deal of ſervice, which was, that lying in a trance which was frequent with him as well as *Mahomet*, he ſaw *God the Father commending* Ignatius *and his Brethren to his Son Jeſus bearing his Croſs*; *whom he very kindly received, and ſpake theſe words with a ſmile to* Ignatius, *I will be favourable to you at* Rome: which gave him and his companions great comfort. At *Rome*, hearing the fame of St. *Benedict* and his *Revelations*, or remembring them in the *Legends*, he withdraws to the ſame place, *Monte Caſſino*, and there it fell out luckily (that he might come behind none of them in *viſions*) that as St. *Benedict* ſaw the ſoul of *Germanus* go to Heaven, ſo did he in the very ſame man-

L. 2. c. 5.

manner, the ſoul of *Hozius*, one of his *Society*; and a little after, as he was praying to the *Saints*, he ſaw *Hozius* among them all. Notwithſtanding all this, they met with great difficulties at *Rome*; but *Pope Paul* 3. being throughly ſatisfied in the main point, of their being *ſerviceable* to the *intereſt* of that *Church*, all other difficulties were ſoon conquered; and the *Pope* himſelf became *Enthuſiaſtical* too, and cryed out, *having read*, ſaith *Maffeius*, *the firſt draught of the rules of the Society made by* Ignatius, *The Spirit of the Lord is here*, and many things to the ſame purpoſe. But one of the *Cardinals*, to whom the examination of them was committed, ſtill oppoſing the eſtabliſhing this *Order*, *Ignatius* flies to his uſual refuges; for beſides *faſtings*, *prayers*, *keeping of dayes*, &c. he and his Friends offered *three thouſands Maſſes* for this end alone: (and it muſt be a hard heart indeed, that would not yield with ſo much ſuppling) this *Cardinal* all of a ſudden quite changed his mind, and commended the buſineſs himſelf to the *Pope*: and ſo the Society of *Jeſus* was confirmed by the *Popes Bull*, 3 *Octob. A. D.* 1540. to the joy of *Ignatius* his heart; and ſoon after he was made *General* of the *Order*, which he accepted with as many tears and proteſtations, and intreaties (till he plainly ſaw *it was the will of God it muſt be ſo*) as ever any *Uſurper* took the *Government* into his hands, which he had moſt eagerly ſought after. And now let the world judge, whether there hath appeared a greater *Enthuſiaſt* or *pretender* to *revelations*, than *Ignatius* was, ſince the dayes of *Mahomet*,

Maff. l. 2. c. 12.

homet, and St. *Francis*? Methinks they might be aſhamed to upbraid, us with the *Fanaticiſm* of the *Quakers* and ſuch perſons; the chiefeſt of whom fall very much ſhort of *Ignatius*, in thoſe very things for which they are condemned by us; yet any one who compares them, would imagine, the *life of Ignatius* had been their *great exemplar*. I know not whether any of that *innocent* and *religious order* of *Jeſuits*, had any hand in forming this *new Society* among us (as hath been frequently ſuggeſted) but if one may gueſſe the *Father* by the *Childs* likeneſs, *Ignatius Loyola* the *founder* of the *Jeſuits*, was at leaſt the *Grandfather* of the *Quakers*.

Of the Fanatick way of devotion amorg them.

§. 14. Thus I have gone through the moſt illuſtrious Orders of the *Church* of *Rome*; and ſhewed, how they have been founded on *Fanaticiſm*, and given encouragement thereby unto it. It remains now, that I conſider the *way* of *devotion*, in greateſt requeſt among them; and prove, that it doth encourage and promote *Enthuſiaſme*. For this; we are to take notice, that thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome*, who have ſet themſelves to the Writing Books of Devotion, have with great zeal recommended ſo myſtical and unintelligible a way of devotion, as though their deſign had been only to amuſe and confound the minds of devout perſons, and to prepare them for the moſt groſs *Enthuſiaſme* and extravagant illuſions of Fancy. But this is the fruit of leaving the *Scriptures*, and that moſt plain and certain way of *Religion* delivered therein; there can be no end of Phantaſtical

ſtical modes of devotion, and every ſuperſtitious *Fanatick* will be ſtill inventing more, or reviving old ones. No Laws or Rules publickly allowed can ſerve their turn, they muſt have ſomething peculiar to themſelves, to gain a reputation of greater ſanctity by; and it is hard, if they do not light upon ſome affected phraſes, unintelligible notions, ridiculous or ſingular poſtures, that they may be ſure to charge thoſe with following carnal reaſon who condemn them. And they triumph in nothing more, than when they can handſomely revenge themſelves on that bitter enemy of theirs, called *Reaſon*; which they never do with greater pleaſure, than when they pretend it to be upon the account of *Religion*. In the *Church* of *Rome*, the caſe hath been thus; among them, as in all *Religions* and places in the World, there are ſome perſons of a temper naturally diſpoſed more to *Religion*, than others are; being melancholy, thoughtful, tender, and eaſily moved by hopes and fears. Theſe do more eaſily receive the impreſſions of *Religion*, which they being poſſeſſed with, if they be not carefully governed, are more lyable to fall into the dotages of *ſuperſtition*, or to be tranſported by the heats of *Enthuſiaſme*. Againſt both of them, there can be no better cure imaginable, than the true underſtanding the nature and reaſonableneſs of the *Chriſtian Religion*, which fills our minds with a true ſenſe of *God* and *goodneſs*, and ſo arms us againſt *ſuperſtition*; and withal acquaints us, that the conduct of the *Spirit* of *God* is in the uſe of the greateſt reaſon

and prudence, and ſo prevents the follies of *Enthuſiaſme*. But it being ſo much the deſign of that *Church*, to keep the members of it from knowing any thing, that is ſo much againſt her intereſt, as the true practice of Chriſtianity is; and therefore keeping the Bible out of the hands of the people, they muſt ſubſtitute ſome other wayes in the room of that, to gratifie the earthy dulneſs of a *ſuperſtitious* temper, and the airineſs and warmth of the *Enthuſiaſtical*. For the former; they are abundantly provided, by a tedious and ceremonious way of external devotion, as dull and as cold as the earth it ſelf: to the other they commend *abſtractedneſs of life, mental prayer, paſſive unions, a Deiform fund of the ſoul, a ſtate of introverſion, divine inſpirations*; which muſt either end in *Enthuſiaſme*, or madneſs. And the perfection of this ſtate lying in *an intime Union with God (as they ſpeak) whereby the ſoul is Deified*, is to be attained only *in the way of unknowing*, (for nothing ſo dangerous as the *uſe* of *reaſon*) and *ſelf-annihilation*, and many other things as impoſſible to be underſtood, as practiſed. Which makes it difficult, to give any account of ſuch unintelligible ſtuffe; for we muſt only grope in obſcurity and profound darkneſs, and draw a *Night piece* without lights. This way came firſt into requeſt in the *Monaſtick* orders, by the examples of their founders, as will eaſily appear by our former diſcourſe; but the men who moſt ſolemnly preached and divulged it, were *Ruſbrochius*, *Suſo*, *Harphius*, *&c.* and he who, in theſe latter ages, hath gathered together moſt that had been

ſaid

ſaid before him, and is commended by *Balthaſar Corderius* and others as a moſt ſublime interpreter of myſtical Divinity, *Ludovicus Bloſius*; from theſe, it were not difficult to put together ſome of their words and phraſes, as an account of their Divinity; but I rather chooſe to do it, chiefly from a late Author, publiſhed by Mr. *Creſſy*, not many years ſince; who, after his many turnings and changes of opinions, ſits down at laſt (as appears by his publiſhing *Mother Juliana's* revelations, and the *Preface* to *Sancta Sophia*) with the deſerved Character of a *Popiſh Fanatick*. Which Book of *Sancta Sophia*, being compiled by Mr. *Creſſy* out of many writings of *Father Auguſtin Baker*, and ſet forth *A. D.* 1657. with large approbations at the beginning and end of it, I hope no doctrine contained therein will be thought a ſcandal to their *Church*. The deſign of it is as the title tells us, *To give directions for the Prayer of Contemplation*, &c. I would they had given directions for underſtanding it, in the firſt place; for if we have no other help, than what Mr. *Creſſy* gives in his Preface, we may as well hope to underſtand the *Quakers Canting*, as Mr. *Creſſy's*. Let the Reader judge of it, by theſe few paſſages in his Preface. *The only proper diſpoſition, towards the receiving ſupernatural irradiations from Gods Holy Spirit, is an abſtraction of life; a ſequeſtration from all buſineſs that concerns others* (though it be their ſalvation) *and an attendance to God alone, in the depth of the Spirit.* And a little after, *the lights here deſired and prayed for, are ſuch*

Corderii Iſagog. in myſtic. Theolog. Dionyſ. c. 7.

Preface to *Sancta Sophia. f.* 33.

as

as do expel all images of creatures, and do calm all manner of paſſions; to the end that the ſoul being in a vacuity, may be more capable of receiving and entertaining God, in the pure fund of the Spirit. What this *pure fund of the Spirit* means, I had been ſomewhat ſo ſeek, had not *Lud. Bloſius* in the Preface to his *ſpiritual Inſtitution* told us, that *the Deiform fund of the ſoul*, is the *ſimple eſſence of the ſoul ſtamped with a divine impreſs*; or if this be not plain enough, *that from whence ariſeth a ſuper-eſſential life*: but if yet it cannot be underſtood, we may be the leſs troubled at it, ſince the ſame Au-

Lud. Bloſii. Inſtit. Spirit. cap. 12. thor ſaith afterward, *that very few do know that hidden fund of their ſouls, or believe that they have ſuch a thing within them.* It being, it ſeems, like ſome very cunning drawer in a *Cabinet*, where the main treaſure lyes; which the owner himſelf cannot find out, till it be broken to pieces: for *ſelf-annihilation* is neceſſarily required, in order to it. And this *ſuper-eſſential life*, as he admirably deſcribes it, is a certain new and cunning way of knowing without thoughts, of ſeeing in darkneſs, of underſtanding without reaſon, of unknowing *God* by perceiving him, of being melted and brought to nothing firſt, and then being loſt and ſwallowed up in *God*, by which means all created being is put off, and that which is only divine put on, being changed into *God*, as iron heated into the nature of fire. This being the *ſtate* of *perfection*, aimed at here in this world, we muſt now conſider the directions given in order to it. To this end, in the firſt place, *a con-*

contemplative state is commended above an active, as more perfect and more easie, more simple and more secure from all errours and illusions which may be occasioned by an indiscreet use of Prayer. Where, by an *active* and *contemplative state*, we must not understand what we commonly do by those terms; but the *active state* is, *the use of reasoning and internal discourse, to fix our affections upon God, and expressing it self in sensible devotion and outward acts of obedience to Gods will*; the *contemplative*, in the Authors language is, *seeking God in the obscurity of faith with a more profound introversion of Spirit, and with less activity and motion in sensitive nature, and without the use of grosser images; and such souls are not of themselves*, he saith, *much inclined to external works; but they seek rather to purifie themselves and inflame their hearts to the love of God, by internal, quiet and pure actuations in spirit; by a total abstraction from creatures, by solitude both external and especially internal; so disposing themselves to receive the influxes and inspirations of God, whose guidance chiefly they endeavour to follow in all things.* Now, he saith, *the security of such a state, above the other, lyes in this; that a contemplative soul tending to God, and working almost only with the heart and blind affections of the will, pouring themselves upon God, apprehended only in the obscure notion of faith, not enquiring what he is, but believing him to be that incomprehensible being which he is, and which can only be comprehended by himself, rejecting and striving to forget all Images and representations*

Sancta Sophia treat. 1. c. 3. s. 1, 2.

Treat. 1. c. 1. s. 4, 5.

Sancta Sophia. cap. 3. s. 2.

of

of him, or any thing elſe; yea tranſcending all operations of the imagination, and all ſubtlety and curioſity of reaſoning; and laſtly, ſeeking an union with God, only by the moſt pure and moſt intime affections of the ſpirit, what poſſibility of illuſion or errour can there be to ſuch a ſoul? none doubtleſs; for this is more, than a meer *ſleep* of the ſoul: for all *reaſoning* and *images* of *things* being wholly laid aſide, there is not ſo much as a poſſibility of *dreaming* left. The next thing he takes notice of, which is very
S. 3. well obſerved, is *that men given to ſublime ſpeculations* (or I ſuppoſe any, who have the uſe of reaſon) *are not ſo capable of it, as unlearned perſons and Women*; and therefore *Father Leander à Sancto Martino* approves the Book, *as containing very ſound and wholeſome doctrine for*
The approbations. *the direction of devout ſouls, and fit and agreeable to our calling and rule; and eſpecially for the*
pag. 319. *uſe of our Dames*; becauſe they might more eaſily ſwallow it, as they do pills, without chewing; and ſo find not any bitterneſs in it: which is to the ſame purpoſe, with that reaſon *Baker* himſelf gives, viz. *that the perfection of contemplation ſcarcely at all lyes in the operations of the underſtanding.* A moſt admirable way of contemplating with the will: but why might it not conſiſt as well in the *volition* of the *underſtanding*, as in the *contemplation* of the *Will?* The proper end of this *contemplative life*, he
S. 6. addes, *is the attaining to an habitual and almoſt uninterrupted perfect union with God, in the ſupream point of the ſpirit* (or rather *fund* as Mr. *Creſſy* more *myſtically* calls it) *and ſuch an union,*

union, as gives the ſoul a fruitive poſſeſſion of him, and a real experimental perception of his divine preſence in the depth and center of the ſpirit, which is fully poſſeſſed and filled with him alone. And leſt we ſhould think, this were all to be hoped for in this contemplative ſtate, he ſaith further, *that beſides this active union,* S. 11. *wherein the ſoul her ſelf concurrs, there are others meerly paſſive, in which God after a wonderful and inconceivable manner affords them interiour illuminations and touches, yet far more efficacious and Divine; in all which, the ſoul is a meer patient and only ſuffers God to work his divine pleaſure in her, being neither able to further, or hinder it. The which unions though they laſt but even as it were a moment of time, yet do more illuminate and purifie the ſoul, than many years ſpent in active exerciſes of ſpiritual Prayer, or Mortification, could do.*

The ſteps he ſets down, in order to this ſtate Cap. 4 S. 11. of perfection, are, 1. *The way of external and imaginary exerciſes of Prayer; in which, without a diſcreet diligence and conſtancy in them, the ſoul may perhaps end her dayes therein.* A ſad caſe, to end our dayes as *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* did; who uſed this low diſpenſation of *praying* to the laſt! But alas, they never underſtood theſe *paſſive unions* with *God*, in the *ſound of the ſpirit*; they taught men a plain and intelligible way of ſerving *God*, and bid them look for perfection in another world. 2. *Aſpirations and pure elevations of the ſuperiour Will.* 3. The *divine inaction.*

4. Then

4. Then when one would least expect them, follow, *woful obscurities and desolations:* and after them; 5. Comes the *State of perfection.*

Treat. 3. *Sect.* 11. *cap.* 1. *S.* 10. Elsewhere he describes the progress towards this *State* of *perfection* thus, *that he who would come to it must practise the drawing of his external senses inwardly to his internal, there losing and as it were annihilating them; then he must draw his internal senses, into the superiour powers of the soul, and there annihilate them likewise; and those powers of the intellectual soul he must draw into that which is called their unity; and lastly that Unity, which alone is capable of perfect union with God, must be applied and firmly fixed on God; wherein the perfect divine contemplation lyes. In* *S.* 15. *which union,* he saith, *all is vacuity or emptiness, as if nothing were existent but God and the soul; yea so far is the soul from reflecting on her own existence, that it seems to her, God and she are not distinct, but one only thing.* This is called by some mystick Authors the *state* of *Nothingness*; by others (it being indifferent it seems among them) the *state* of *Totality*; but the most sublime description

Treat. 3. *sect.* 4. *c.* 6. *S.* 8. of it, is that *of the Union of nothing with nothing:* which being hard terms to be understood, he explains them thus, *that the soul being no where corporally or sensibly, is every where spiritually and immediatly united to God this infinite nothing.* By which, it is just as intelligible as it was before. Nay, which I think is the highest state of all, it is, *that the* *S.* 9. *soul comes to a feeling of her not being, and by con-*

consequence of the not being of creatures; the which is indeed a real truth: or else intolerable nonsense; as we cannot think it otherwise, who know we have cause to thank *God*, we are yet in our *Wits*, and are not possessed with such a *Spiritual Frenzy*, as this *Author* saith, *Fryer* Bernard *one of the disciples of St.* Francis *had*; neither was the other free from it, who as *Baker* related, *in the heat of his interiour affection, could usually cry out nothing but V. V. V.* Neither can any persons, who have any use of their understandings left, think such discourses the effect of any thing, but of the height of *Enthusiasm* or a *Religious Madness*. I do not think such expressions, as those I have already produced, can be paralleld by the most frantick *Enthusiasts*, that have been since the beginning of the *Family of love*. Yet these Books are *licensed*, *approved*, nay *admired* in the *Roman Church*; whereas we have alwayes disowned, disproved, and condemned any such Writers among us, and have used all care to suppress and confute them. The plain effect of such *Enthusiastick* fooleries is, to make Religion laughed at by some, despised by others, and neglected by all, who take no other measures of it, than from such confounded Writers. If once an unintelligible way of practical *Religion*, become the standard of *devotion*, no men of sense and reason will ever set themselves about it; but leave it to be *understood* by *madmen*, and *practised* by *Fools*. // Treat. 3. sect. 4. S. 19, 20.

§. 15. But

The utmost effect of this way is gross Enthusiasm. Treat. 1. sect. 2. cap. 1. S. 6. S. 7. S. 12. Cap. 5. S. 10.

§. 15. But supposing this way were intelligible and practicable, which it is not; yet what would the effect of it be, but the highest *Enthusiasm*? For the same Author layes it down, as a fundamental rule, *that God only, by his holy Inspirations, is the guide and director, in an Internal contemplative life; and that all the light they have therein, is from immediate divine illumination, as well as our strength from the divine operation: and that this light doth extend further and to more and other more particular objects, than the divine light or Grace, by which good Christians living common lives in the world are led, extends to; yea than it does even in those, that seek perfection by the exercises of an active life.* But which is very extraordinary in this supernatural light, he saith *that generally when there is proposed the not doing or doing of an external work, and both of them are lawful, the divine inspiration moves to the not doing*; but this is not all, but among the impediments to *divine Inspirations* he reckons, not only *all external duties of Religion, but the doing things meerly for Edification.* A most excellent and *Apostolical* doctrine! but it is happy for the *Christian* world, the *Apostles* had other kind of *Inspirations* from these: or else they had never done much good in the World, or been such eminent examples of holy life and actions. What becomes of all the precepts they have left us of doing good, of mutual edification, of constant business, besides the commands for the outward duties of Worship, if these be the hinderances in the way to perfection?

And

And although he would not have *his spiritual, internal liver to pretend to extraordinary apparitions, voices, conversations with spirits, message from Heaven*, &c. Yet in his Discourse of *Passive Unions*, he saith, *that God reveals himself to the soul, by a supernatural species impressed in her; which revelations are either sensible as apparitions, words, &c. or intellectual, either immediately, or by Angels; the effects of which supernatural inactions of God are Rapts or Extasies, internal visions, &c. in which*, he saith, *that the less experienced and imperfect, are to advise with their directour about them; but those who were more eminently perfect, have followed their own light in judging of those things and practising accordingly, without consulting others*; and withall adds, *that such souls which receive these things, must carefully observe her internal direction: and that they are not so absolutely obliged to resign their judgements and wills to others, as to neglect their own proper call received from God.* And doth this doctrine now differ from that of the *Fanatick Sectaries*, which have swarmed in *England*? Yes. Mr. *Cressy*, in his Preface, undertakes at large to shew the difference: by answering the objection taken from thence, against the publishing this doctrine; because it would justifie them, in all their frenzies and disorders: and in order to this; 1. He very foolishly goes about to prove *the necessity of divine Inspirations*, from *the necessity of divine Grace, for the doing good actions*; which is not denyed by the greatest enemies to *Enthusiasme*. 2. He saith, *we ought to correspond to those Divine*

Sect. 2. c. 1. S. 14.

Treat. 3. sect. 4. cap. 3. S. 2.

S. 6.

S. 36.

S. 37.

Cressy's Preface to *Sancta Sophia*. S. 23.

S. 24.

Inspirations, which stirr us up to good actions; if he means by them nothing but the assistance of
S. 25. Divine Grace, no one questions it. 3. *That there may be false suggestions of the Devil, which may appear like the motions of Gods Spirit.*
S. 27. 4. That, *it being necessary these should be distinguished from each other, the only means imaginable, that can be proper, natural, and efficacious to obtain such a supernatural light to discern Gods will in all things, is pure spiritual prayer exercised by a soul living an abstracted, internal, recollected life, spent in a continual attendance on God, &c. i. e.* in short, the directions of *F. Augustine Baker*. And is not this, think we, a very cunning way of vindicating his doctrine from *Fanaticism*, to make *Enthusiasm* necessary to *distinguish the motions* of the *good* and *bad Spirit* in our minds? I have already shewed, that he teaches the highest *Enthusiasm*; and it seems, those who made the objection were sensible of it. But how doth Mr. *Cressy* answer it? by shewing what they condemn'd to be necessary; and in effect, that no man can know the difference between the motions of the *Holy Ghost* and the *Devil*, but by *Enthusiasm*: says that is the plain meaning of his words; for this *contemplative prayer*, he saith, is the only means to gain such a *supernatural light*, whereby we can distinguish one from the other. An admirable way! to tell men they must first be mad, before they can know whether they be in their wits or no. But since this *contemplative state*, hath besides the common though *immediate illuminations*, many *passive unions*,

or

or *extraordinary revelations* attending it; suppose the Question were put, how one should know whether these came from *God*, or the *Devil*, what answer will Mr. *Cressy* then give? will he return back again to try *illuminations* by *inspirations* (as he calls them) and so *inspirations* by *illuminations*, which is just like the *Scripture* by the *Church*, and *Church* by *Scripture*?

But here, saith Mr. *Cressy*, *is no pretending to new or strange revelations, no walking in mirabilibus super se:* yes I think he doth so, when he utters these things; for what are *passive unions*, but *new revelations*, and as great, as ever any *Fanatick Sectary* pretended to? Did not they deliver this for their Doctrine, that men ought to hearken to the immediate impulses of the *Spirit of God* within them; and that now, *God* doth acquaint his own people with his mind and will, in a way peculiar to themselves? And what have they done, of the *mystical way*, but only changed a few terms, and asserted the thing it self higher, than our *Enthusiasts* did; who did not boast of so many *raptures*, *visions*, and *revelations*, as those of the *Church* of *Rome* have done. *Lud. Blosius*, in his Works, hath one Book called *Monile Spirituale*; which consists of nothing, but the new and strange revelations which were made to four Women Saints, St. *Gertrude*, St. *Mathildis*, St. *Brigitt*, and St. *Catharine*; and in his Preface saith, *it is a sign of a carnal mind, to despise such revelations as these are: for the Church of God is wonderfully enlightned by them. What*, saith he, *did not the Prophets*

S. 29.

Lud Blosii Monile Spirit. p. 78.

and Apoſtles receive truth from Heaven by Revelations? As though the caſe were the very ſame in theſe melancholy Women, and in the holy *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*; and we had juſt as much reaſon to believe the effects of *hyſterical vapours*, and of the *divine Spirit*. And leſt we ſhould imagine, theſe were only the *Fancies* of ſome Women, which their Church would not be concerned for the credit of, he concludes with ſaying, *that theſe Revelations were known to the world and approved*. For thoſe of St. *Brigitt*, we have before ſhewed how much they were approved; For St. *Gertrudes*, he ſaith the ſame; and *that one very learned and illuminate man did ſay, after the accurate reading of them, that man could not have the Spirit of God, who Queſtioned whether thoſe revelations came from it or no.* And therefore *Bloſius* is ſo far from denying any new or ſtrange revelations among them, that being a devout man, *he prays God to pardon thoſe, who queſtioned the authority of theſe revelations.* But if no *new revelations* are allowed among them, what means that ſaying in the *ſpiritual exerciſes* of the *Jeſuits*, *p.* 31, 32. of the Impreſſion, *A. D.* 1574. *It is the great perfection of a Chriſtian, to keep himſelf indifferent, to do what God ſhall reveal to him; and not to determine himſelf to do, what he hath already revealed and taught in the Goſpel.* This is ſpeaking to the purpoſe; and leſt I ſhould ſeem to charge any unjuſtly, (this paſſage not appearing in the latter impreſſions) it may be found in the *Moral practice* of the *Jeſuits*, from the *Biſhop* of *Malaga*. But the *Jeſuits* are

Moral Practice of Jeſuits, p. 379.

are not so much Mr. *Cressy*'s Friends, that he should be concerned in their *Vindication:* I can tell him therefore of a Friend of his, whom I am sure he is concerned for, that is for *new and strange revelations* too; and that is the *worthy publisher* of the *sixteen Revelations of Mother Juliana:* and if those be not *new* and *strange*, I think none ever ought to be accounted so.

But supposing they have *new* and *strange revelations* among them, yet Mr. *Cressy* saith, *they are not seditious and troublesome to the World; no dissolving unity, or crossing lawful authority by them; because these are enjoyed in solitude and retirements, and supposing they be mistaken, no harm would accrew to others by it.* As though persons were ever the less mad for being chained, and having a *keeper* assigned them: such in effect, do they make the office of a *confessour* to these *contemplatives.* The mischief to the world is not so great while they are kept up, but that to *Religion* is unsufferable; while they lead devout persons in such an unintelligible way, that the highest degree of their perfection is *Madness.* But I have already proved at large, that they have not been able in some cases, or willing in others, to keep up these *Enthusiastical* persons among them; but they have done as much to the disturbance of the peace, and been as unreclaimable among them, as ever any *Fanatick Sectaries* have done or been in *England.* And we are not to think, that the Principles of their *Church* are such quiet, meek and obedient things, that not a man S. 33.

among them would ever lift up his finger to give any disturbance to the peace of a Nation: For,

Of their Fanaticism in resisting Authority under a pretence of Religion.

§. 16. I now come to prove, that they are as much guilty of the second sort of *Fanaticism* as any *Sectaries* among us have been; which is the resisting authority, under a pretence of *Religion*. This I shall prove by two things. 1. That that the Principles and practices of the *Jesuitical party* in the *Roman Church*, are as destructive to *Government*, as of the most *Fanatick Sectaries*, which ever have been among us. 2. That this party is the most countenanced, and encouraged by the *Court* of *Rome*.

1. That the Principles and Practices of the *Jesuitical party* in the *Roman Church* are as destructive to *Government*, as of the most *Fanatick Sectaries* which ever have been among us. What effects of *Fanaticism* have we seen in *England* so dreadful, which may not be paralleld with *examples*, or justified by the *principles* of that party? Is it, that so many mens lives have been destroyed, under a pretence of *Religion?* and do they think the *Massacre* at *Paris*, and the *Rebellion* in *Ireland*, can ever be forgotten by us? Is it, that *Government* was supposed by them to be so originally in the people, that they by their *representatives* may call their *Soveraign* to an account, and alter the *form* of *Government?* This is the expres doctrine of the *Jesuits*: for, saith *Bellarmin*, *Civil power is immediately in the people, as the immediate subject of it: and*

Bellar. de laicis, l. 3. c. 6.

is

is indifferently transferred by them, either to one or many; and if they see cause they may change it as they see good, from a Monarchy, to an Aristocratie, or a Democratie. But because after the writing that Book, some persons had published a doctrine contrary to his; therefore, in the *recognition* of his *works*, he endeavours to strengthen what he had delivered, and produces a saying of *Navarre*, *that the people never do transferr their power so far to the King, but they retain it habitually in themselves; and may in certain cases, resume it into their own hands.* *John Mariana*, whose name will never be forgotten in these matters, determines the case plainly, *That if there be no hope of a Princes amendment, the Common-wealth may take away his Kingdom; and because that cannot be done without War, they may raise armies against him; and having proclaimed the King their publick enemy, may take away his life.* Reynolds, in his Book of the just *abdication of* Henry 3. of France, saith, *that all the Majesty of the Kingdom is in the assembly of the states, to whom it belongs to bridle the Kingly power, and to settle all things that belong to the publick Government.* This is a doctrine fitted for such a season, wherein there is hopes to prevail upon a considerable party (as in the *League* in *France*) to do their business; but in case the *States* of the *Kingdom* be faithful to their Prince, they have easier wayes of dispatch. And to this end, they declare it lawful for any person, to take away the life of a *Prince* excommunicated by the *Pope*. But here, their juggling and shuffling

Recognit. p. 56.

Mariana de Regis Instit. l. 1. c. 6.

De justâ abdicatione Hen. 3. l. 3. c. 8.

ſhew their meaning is not good; for they who mean honeſtly, are not afraid to ſpeak plainly. If any one ask them, *Whether it be lawful to kill their Soveraign?* they will tell you *by no means*, and that none of them ever ſaid ſo; but he being excommunicated they do not account him *their Soveraign*, and ſo they may lawfully do it. Nay it is avowed by ſome of them, *that it is a point of faith, to believe it is in the Popes power to depoſe Heretical Princes; and that ſubjects are, upon their being declared heretical, thereby abſolved from all duty of obedience to them. Nay, that there needs no ſentence of the Pope to be pronounced againſt him:* and *Mariana* makes *an intention of publick good, or, the advice of grave men ſufficient*; ſuch as the Jeſuits in *France* were to *Clement*, *Chaſtel*, and *Ravaillac*, the firſt and laſt the actual Murtherers of *Henry* 3. and *Henry* 4. and the ſecond ſhewed his good intentions when he ſtabbed *Henry* 4. in the mouth. If any *Prieſt*, or *Fryer* ſhould attempt it, they have an excellent *ſalvo* for him, that *being a ſpiritual perſon* (according to their doctrine of *exemption*) *he is no Subject to the King.* If the Authority of the *Council* of *Conſtance* be objected by them, as the *doctrine of their Church*, againſt theſe Principles, they have withall given us an anſwer, that it meddles not with the caſe of *Soveraign Heretical Princes excommunicated by the Pope.* I need not produce the particular teſtimonies in this matter, of *Bellarmin*, *Suarez*, *Valentia*, *Vaſquez*, with the herd of the *Jeſuitical* order who follow theſe; having

Philopater. edictum. Eliz. ab. p. 149.

having been produced by so many already, and particularly by the two worthy Authors of the *Answer* to *Philanax*, and the *Papists Apology*; from the latter of whom, we shortly expect a more accurate examination of these things: and by the former may appear, what influence the *Jesuitical party* had upon the most barbarous effects of *Fanaticism* here, in the Murther of a most excellent Prince. To whose observations I shall only add this, that *A. D.* 1648. a Book was Printed with this Title, *Several Speeches delivered at a Conference, concerning the Power of Parliament to proceed against their King for misgovernment*, licensed by *Gilb. Mabbot*; which is, word for word, taken out of *Parsons* the *Jesuits* Book of succession to the *Crown of* England (purposely designed against our *Kings* title) as will appear to any one, who will take the pains to compare them. By which we may see to whom our *Fanaticks* owed their principles, and their precedents; and how much *Father Parsons* (though at that distance) contributed to the cutting off the *Kings* Head. But it may be now they have changed their principles, and renounced all these Doctrines; we should like them so much the better, if they once did this freely and sincerely; and not with sly tricks and æquivocations, which they use in these matters, whenever they are pinched with them. Let them, without *mental reservations*, declare but these two points; that *the Pope cannot absolve the Kings Subjects, from the Oath of Allegiance they make to him*; and, that *though the Pope should*

Answ. to Philan. chap. 5. p. 111.
Answ. to Apology. p. 6.
Answ. to Philan. p. 53. to 65.

should excommunicate the King as a Heretick, and raise War against him, they are bound to defend the King against the Pope; and by the owning these two Propositions, they will gain more upon our belief of their fidelity, than the large Volumn in vindication of the *Irish Remonstrance* hath done; For there they faker, in the very entrance; for being charged from *Rome*, *that by their Remonstrance they had fallen under the condemnation of the Bull of* Paul 5. *against the Oath of Allegiance*, they give these three Answers which ought to be considered by us. 1. *That in the Oath of Allegiance they swear and testifie in their Consciences before God and the World, that King* Charles *is their lawful King, and that the Pope hath no power to depose,* &c. *Wherein they only acknowledge it.* 2. *That in the Oath of Allegiance, the contrary opinion is condemned, which is not in theirs.* 3. *That in the Oath of Allegiance, they declare that they believe that the Pope cannot dispense with that Oath, or any part of it; but this is omitted by them:* and surely not without reason on their parts, but with little satisfaction on ours. And it is easie to observe, that this *Remonstrance* was grounded upon this, *that the Pope owned our King to be lawful King of* England (a great kindness) and this being supposed, all the rest follows naturally, as they well prove against the *Divines* of *Louvain*; but suppose it should come into his *Holiness*'s head, to be of another opinion, we see no assurance but they will be so too. And it may make the *Pope* more cautious for the future, how he declares himself, when such ill

Remonstr. Hiberor. p. 1. ca 4 S. 2.

Remonstr. Hib. 1. c. 2 art. 2. 5.

use

use is made of it; and others, how they rely upon such *Remonstrances*, which have still a tacit reservation of the *Popes* power to declare and dispense. But will they declare it unlawful to resist Authority, when the cause of their *Church* is concerned; and supposing that thereby they can settle the *Pope* in the full exercise of his spiritual *Authority* among us? No, this is their *Good old Cause*, that undermines *Parliaments*, that *Sanctifies* Rebellion, and turns *Nuptials* into *Massacres*. This is that which changes *blood* into *Holy Water*, and *dying* for Treason into *Martyrdom*; this is that which gives the glory at *Rome* to *Regicides*, and makes the Pictures of *Guevet*, *Guignard* and *Garnet*, so much valued there; of which we have a sufficient testimony, from *Monsr. S. Amour*; who tells us, that among the several Pourtraicts of Jesuits, publickly sold there with permission of the Superior, he saw one of *Garnet*, with this Inscription, *Pater Henricus Garnetus Anglus, Londini pro fide Catholicâ suspensus & sectus 3 Maii 1606.* Father *Henry Garnet*, hanged and quartered at *London*, for the Catholick Faith: by which we see, that Treason and the Catholick faith are all one at *Rome*; for nothing can be more notorious, than that *Garnet* suffered only on the account of the *Gunpowder-Treason*; of which as *M. S. Amour* observes, he acknowledged himself guilty before he dyed. The most dangerous Sect among us, is of those who under pretence of setting up the *Kingdom of Christ*, think it lawful to overturn the *Kingdoms* of the World. But herein

Caron. p. 1. c. 5. S. 24. p. 25.

S. Amour's Journal part. 2. ch. 11. p. 58.

herein they have mightily the advantage of those of the *Church* of *Rome*, that what they do for *Christ*, the other do it only for his *Vicar*: and surely if either were lawful, it is much fitter to do it for one, than for the other. We are of opinion, that it is somewhat better being under *Christs* own Government, than the *Popes*, whatever they think; but we condemn any *opposition* to *Government*, under any pretence whatsoever, and though *Venner* and his company acted to the height of *Fanaticism*, among our Sectaries; yet *Guido Faux* with his companions in their Church, went beyond them.

2. That party which hath been most destructive *to Civil Government*, hath had the most countenance and encouragement from *Rome*. Of which I shall give but two *instances*, but sufficient to prove the thing, *A. D.* 1594. 27 of *December John Castel* a Citizens Son of *Paris*, and disciple of the *Jesuits*, having been three years in the School, watched his opportunity to stab *Henry* 4. but by his stooping, just at the time of the blow, he struck him only into the mouth; upon which the *Jesuits* were banished *France*, and a *Pyramid* erected in the place of his *Fathers* house; in the Front whereof towards the *Palace gate*, the *Arrest* of the *Court* of *Parliament* against the *Traytor* was engraven, containing his examination and confession, of being a *Scholler* of the *Jesuits*, a Disciple of *Gucrets*; and the sentence passed upon him because he believed it lawful to *Kill Kings*, that *Henry* 4. was not in the *Church*, till he

was

was approved by the *Pope*, &c. This *Arrest* continued without notice taken of it at *Rome*, till *October* 9. *A. D.* 1609. and on that day, it was condemned by the Order of the *Inquisition*, and put into the *Index Expurgatorius*, as it is at this day to be seen. Which was a time wherein many reports were fled abroad in many parts of the Murther of *Henry* 4. and Letters came to *Paris* from several places, to know the truth of it; and the consequence of this was, that it being found how careful the *Court* of *Rome* was to preserve the honor of *Regicides*, it was but seven months and twenty four days, before *Ravaillac* perfected that work which the other had begun. This observation I owe to an ingenuous and learned *Doctor* of the *Sorbon*, yet living; who detests these practices and doctrines, and himself lies under the same *censure* there. And the more to abuse the world, on the same day, a Book of *Mariana's* was suspended; which those, who look no farther than the name, might imagine was the dangerous Book, so much complained of; but upon search it appears, to be a Book quite of another nature, concerning *Coynes*.

Index Expurg. Alex. 7. p. 205.

Joh. Launoy Epistol. par. 6. pag. 358.

The latter instance concerns the *Irish Remonstrance*, the account of which I take from *Caron* the publisher of it. The *Popish Clergy* of *Ireland* (a very few excepted) were accused of *Rebellion*, for opposing themselves to the *Kings* Authority, by the instigation of the *Popes Nuncio*; after which followed a meeting of the *Popish Bishops*, where they banished the *Kings* Lieute-

Remonstr. Hib. p. 1. c. 5. p. 27.

Lieutenant, and took the Royal Authority upon themselves; almost all the *Clergy*, and a great part of the people joyned with them: and therefore it was necessary, since the *Kings* return, to give him better satisfaction concerning their *Allegiance*; and to decline the *Oath* of *Allegiance*, which they must otherwise have taken, some of them agree upon this *Remonstrance* to present to the *King*, the news of which was no sooner come to *Rome*, but *Cardinal Barberin* sends a Letter to the *Irish Nobility* 8 July *A. D.* 1662. *to bid them take heed, of being drawn into the ditch by those blind guides, who had subscribed to some propositions testifying their Loyalty to the King, which had been before condemned by the Apostolick See.* After this the *Popes Nuncio at* Brussels, July 21. 1662. sends them word, *how displeasing their Remonstrance was at* Rome; *and that after diligent examination by the Cardinals and Divines, they found it contained Propositions already condemned by* Paul 5. *and* Innocent 10. *and therefore the Pope gave him order, to publish this among them; that he was so far from approving their Remonstrance, that he did not so much as permit it, or connive at it, and was extremely grieved that the Irish Nobility were drawn into it; and therefore condemned it in this form, That it could not be kept without breach of faith, according to the Decree of* Paul 5. *and that it denyed the Popes Authority in matters of faith, according to that of* Innocent 10. By this very late instance we see, what little countenance they receive from *Rome*, who offer to give any reasonable security to the *King* of their

Cap. 3 p. 6.

Loyalty;

Loyalty; and by the *Popes* own Declaration, the giving of it is an injury to the *faith*, and a denying his *Supremacy*. For which we are to understand that *A. D.* 1648. when the *Papists* were willing to make as good terms for themselves as they could, and it was objected to them, that they held Principles inconsistent with Civil Government, viz. *that the Pope can absolve them from their obedience; that he can depose and destroy Heretical Magistrates, that he can dispense with all Oaths and Contracts they make with those whom they call Hereticks*; upon this they met together, and to save themselves from banishment resolved them in the *Negative*, but no sooner was this heard at *Rome*, but the *Sacred Congregation* condemned *this resolution, as Heretical, and the Subscribers, as liable to the penalties against those who deny the Popes Authority in matters of faith; upon which they are cited to appear at* Rome, *and Censures and Prisons are there prepared for them.* The sum of it then, is, that they can give no security of their Loyalty to the *King*, against the *Popes* power to depose him, and absolve his *Subjects* from whatever *Oaths* they make to him; or they must be accounted *Hereticks* at *Rome* for so doing. For this *Good old Cause* is as much still in request at *Rome*, as ever: and it is in their power to be accounted *Hereticks* at *Rome*, or *bad Subjects* in their own Countrey; but one of them they cannot avoid. So much may suffice to shew, that the most dangerous Principles of *Fanaticism*, either as to *Enthusiasm* or *Civil Government*, are owned and allowed

allowed in the *Church* of *Rome:* And therefore the number of *Fanaticks*, among us, is very unjustly charged upon the reading the *Scriptures* in our own Language. For I hope I have made it evident, by this Discourse, that those who read not the *Scriptures* may be as *Fanatical* and *disloyal*, as those that do: And to say that *Sects and Fanaticisms are the dire effects of the promiscuous reading of the Scriptures*, is in effect to say, that the *Scripture* is a pestilent Book, which God had better have kept to himself, and good for nothing but to confound the World; and that the only way to hinder the mischiefs which it is apt to produce, is (to follow his own comparison) to keep it out of the peoples way, as men do knives and swords from their children.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Of the Diviſions of the Roman Church.

The great pretences of Unity in the Church *of* Rome *conſidered. The* Popes *Authority the fountain of that Unity; what that Authority is which is challenged by the* Popes *over the* Chriſtian *World; the diſturbances which have happened therein, on the account of it. The firſt revolt of* Rome *from the Empire, cauſed by the* Popes; Baronius *his Arguments anſwered. Rebellion the foundation of the greatneſs of that* Church. *The cauſe of the ſtrict League between the* Popes *and the poſterity of* Charles Martel. *The diſturbances made by* Popes, *in the new Empire: Of the quarrels of* Greg. 7. *with the Emperor and other Chriſtian Princes, upon the pretence of the* Popes *Authority. More diſturbances on that account in Chriſtendom, than any other matter of Religion. Of the Schiſms which have happened in the* Roman *Church: particularly thoſe after the time of* Formoſus, *wherein his Ordinations were nulled by his Succeſſors; the Popes oppoſition to each other in that*

Age: *the miſerable ſtate of that Church then deſcribed. Of the* Schiſms *of latter times, by the* Italick *and* Gallick *factions*; *the long continuance of them. The miſchief of thoſe* Schiſms, *on their own principles. Of the diviſions in that Church, about matters of Order and Government. The differences between the Biſhops and the Monaſtick Orders, about exemptions and priviledges*; *the hiſtory of that Controverſie, and the bad ſucceſs the* Popes *had in attempting to compoſe it. Of the quarrel between the* Regulars *and* Seculars *in* England. *The continuance of that Controverſie here, and in* France. *The* Jeſuits *enmity to the Epiſcopal Order and Juriſdiction: the hard caſe of the* Biſhop *of* Angelopolis *in* America. *The Popes ſtill favour the* Regulars, *as much as they dare. The* Jeſuits *way of converting the* Chineſe, *diſcovered by that* Biſhop. *Of the differences in matters of Doctrines, in that* Church. *They have no better way to compoſe them, than we. The* Popes *Authority never truly ended one Controverſie among them. Their ways to evade the deciſions of Popes and Councils. Their diſſenſions are about matters of faith. The ways taken to excuſe their own differences will take away the differences between them and us, manifeſted by* Sancta Clara's *Expoſition of the 39 Articles. Their diſputes not confined to their* Schools, *proved, by a particular inſtance, about the immaculate conception*; *the infinite ſcandals, confeſſed by their own Authors, to have been in their Church about it.*

From

From all which it appears, that the Church *of* Rome *can have no advantage, in point of Unity, above ours.*

2. §. 1. THE other thing objected, as flowing from the promiscuous reading the Scriptures, is, *the number of our Sects*, and *the disturbances which have been among us upon their account*: whereas among them, the Government of the Church is so ordered, as to keep all *in peace and Unity*. This makes it necessary, to examine that admirable *Unity* they boast so much of; and either they mean by it, that there hath been less *disturbance* in the world before the *Reformation*, or no *Schisms* among themselves, or no *differences* in the matters of *Religion*. But I shall now prove: 1. That there have never been greater disturbances in the world, than upon the account of that *Authority* of the *Pope*, which they look on as the *Foundation* of their *Unity*. 2. That there have happened great and scandalous *Schisms* among themselves, on the same account. 3. That their differences in *Religion*, both as to matter of Order, and Doctrine, have been as great, and managed with as much animosity, as any among us.

Of the great pretence of Unity, in the Church of *Rome*.

1. The *disturbances* in the world upon the account of the *Popes Authority*: I meddle not barely with his *Usurpations* (which work is lately and largely done) but the effects of them in these *Western Churches*. For which we are to consider, what *Authority* that is which the *Pope* challenges; and what

History of Romish Usurpations by *Hen. Fowlis*.

diſturbances hath been given to the peace of *Chriſtendom* by it. The *Authority* claimed by the *Pope*, is that of being *Univerſal Paſtor* over the *Catholick Church*, by vertue of which not only ſpiritual direction in matters of faith, but an actual juriſdiction over all the members of it, doth belong unto him. "For otherwiſe, "they ſay, the Government of the *Church* is "imperfect, and inſufficient for its end; be- "cauſe Princes may eaſily overthrow the Unity "of the Church, by favouring Hereticks, if "they be not in ſubjection to the *Pope*, as to "their temporal concernments; becauſe it may "happen that they have a regard to no other, "but theſe; if it were not therefore in the "*Popes* power, to depoſe *Princes*, and abſolve "Subjects from their Alleagiance, when they "oppoſe the *Unity* of the *Church*, his *power*, ſay "they, is an inſignificant title, and cannot reach "the end it was deſigned for. Beſides, they "urge, that all Princes coming into the Church, "are to be ſuppoſed to ſubmit their Scepters to "Chriſt, ſo as to loſe them in caſe they act con- "trary to the *Catholick Church*, of which they "are made members; for *whoſoever doth not* "*hate Father and Mother*, &c. *cannot be my Diſ-* "*ciple*. And what Officer is there ſo fit, to take all *Eſcheats* and *Forfeitures* of *Power*, as Chriſts own Vicar upon Earth? But to add more ſtrength, *Bellarmin* very prettily proves it out of *Paſce oves*, "for every Paſtor muſt have a "threefold power to defend his flock; a power "over Wolves, to keep them from deſtroying "the Sheep; a power over the Rams, that they

Bell. de Pontif. R. l. 5. c. 7.

do

"do not hurt them; and a power over the "Sheep, to give them convenient food: Now, "ſaith he, *very ſubtilly*, if a Prince of a ſheep "ſhould turn a Ram or a Wolf, muſt not he "have power to drive him away, and to keep "the people from following him? This is then the only current doctrine concerning the *Popes* Authority, in the *Court* of *Rome*, and although ſome mince the matter, more than others do, and talk only of an *indirect power*; yet they all mean the ſame thing, and aſcribe ſuch power to the *Pope*, whereby he may *depoſe* Princes, and abſolve ſubjects from the duty they owe to them. And how much in requeſt this Doctrine continues at *Rome*, appears by the Counſel given by *Michael Lonigo*, *Maſter* of the *Palace*, to *Pope Greg.* 15. Printed *A. D.* 1623. about perſwading the *Duke* of *Bavaria*, then newly made *Elector*, to receive a confirmation of his title from the Pope; "to which end, "he ſaith, ſome skilful perſon ought to be im-"ployed to acquaint him, that the power of "the Empire was the meer iſſue of the "*Church*, and did ſpring from it as a Child from "the Mother; and that it was a great ſin for "any *Chriſtian* to call this into Queſtion; "and conſequently, the *Popes* power and au-"thority to determine concerning the ſtate and "affairs of the *Empire*; and this he attempts "to prove, by no fewer than nineteen argu-"ments, all of them drawn from the former "Uſurpations of the *Popes*, and encroachments "upon the Empire: from whence he concludes, "that the *Electorſhip* could not be lawfully

Conſilium Greg. 15. *exhibitum per Mich. Lonigum. A.D.*1623.

"taken away from one, and given to another, "without the *Popes* conſent and Authority; "and that ſuch a diſpoſal of it was in it ſelf "*null*, and of no force. The ſame year, came forth a Book of *Aphoriſms* concerning the reſtoring the ſtate of the Church, by the decree and approbation of the *Colledge* of *Cardinals*, collected by the ſame perſon, and by him preſented to the *Pope*; wherein the ſame power of the *Pope* is aſſerted, and that it belongs to him to transfer the Electoral dignity from one to another; and that it ought to be taken away from the *Electors* of *Saxony*, and *Brandenburg*, for oppoſing his Authority; and that to allow the *Emperor* authority in theſe things, was to rob the *Apoſtolick* See of its due rights. By which we may underſtand, what that Authority over the Church is which is challenged by the *Pope* as ſupream Paſtor, in order to the preſerving the Unity of it.

Aphoriſmi de ſtatu eccleſiæ reſtaurando per Mi b. Longum.

Of the diſturbances of the Chriſtian World, under the pretence of the *Popes* Authority.

§. 2. We now conſider, what the bleſſed effects of this pretended power hath been in the Chriſtian World: and I doubt not to make it appear, that this very thing hath cauſed more wars and bloodſhed, more confuſions and diſorders, more revolts and rebellions in *Chriſtendom*, than all other cauſes put together have done, ſince the time it was firſt challenged; and this I ſhall prove, from their own Authors; and ſuch, whoſe credit is the greateſt among them. The revolt of *Rome*, and the adjacent parts, from the ſubjection due to the *Roman Emperor*, then reſident at *Conſtantinople*, was wholly cauſed by the *Pope*. The firſt *Pope*, ſaith

saith *Onuphrius*, that ever durst openly resist the *Emperor* was *Constantine* I. who opposed *Philippicus* in the matter of *Images*; which the Emperor commanded to be pulled down, because they were abused to *Idolatry*, and the *Pope* utterly refused to obey; and not only so, but set up more in opposition to him, in the *Portico* of *S. Peter*; and forbad the use of the *Emperors* name and title, in any publick Writings, or Coynes. The same command was not long after renewed by *Leo* 3. upon which, saith *Onuphrius*, *Gregory* 2. then *Pope*, took away the small remainder of the *Roman Empire* from him in *Italy*; and *Sigonius* more expressly, *that he not only excommunicated the Emperor, but absolved all the people of* Italy *from their Allegiance, and forbad the payment of any Tribute to him; whereupon the Inhabitants of* Rome, Campania, Ravenna, *and* Pentapolis, *i. e. the Region about* Ancona, *immediately rebelled; and rose up in opposition to their Magistrates, whom they destroyed. At* Ravenna, Paulus *the Emperors Lieutenant or Exarch was killed; at* Rome, Peter *the Governor had his eyes put out; in* Campania, Exhilaratus *and his Son* Hadrian *were both murthered by the people of* Rome; *and not content with this, he writ a Letter to the Emperor, full of the greatest reproaches imaginable.* Baronius is very hard put to it, to vindicate the Pope; for he confesses, the Rebellion of the people was occasioned by the *Popes* opposing the *Emperor*, and commends their zeal for *Religion* in it, and acknowledgeth that the *Emperor* laid all the blame on the *Pope*, and that the *Greek*

Onuphr. Antor. in Platin. vit. Constant.

Sigonius de regno Italiæ. l. 2. A. D. 726. Naucler. Chronog. Gen. 25.

Baron. Annals Eccles. A. 726. tom. 9.

Hiſtorians, *Theophanes*, and *Zonaras* do ſo too; but all this he ſaith proceeded only from *their ſpight againſt the Roman Church, and their ignorance of affairs in it*; but if we believe him, *the Pope rather endeavoured to keep them in obedience to the Emperour; and when they would have choſen another, he oppoſed it: which he proves, from* Paulus Diaconus, *and* Anaſtaſius. But what is that to the buſineſs? the queſtion is not, Whether the *Pope* did not hinder the chooſing another *Emperor*, but whether he did not draw the people off from their obedience to the *Emperor*, that then was? And this is not only affirmed, by the *Greek Hiſtorians*; but by thoſe of the Roman Church. *Sigebert* ſaith, *that* Gregory 2. *finding the Emperor incorigible, he made* Rome, Italy *and all the Weſt to revolt from him, and forbad his Tributes:* the ſame is affirmed by *Otto Friſingenſis*, *Conradus Urſpergenſis*, *Hieronymus Rubeus*, and others, who cannot be ſuſpected of any enmity to the *Roman Church*. As for the making a *new Emperor*, therein the Pope had another game to play; he was not willing the Souldiery ſhould make another *Emperor:* for as *Hadrianus Valeſius* well obſerves, the *Pope* durſt not ſo affront the *Emperor*, if he had not held a private correſpondency with *Charles Martel* at that time, whoſe Honor and Arms were the greateſt in theſe Weſtern parts. Having thereby ſtrengthened his intereſt againſt both the Emperor his known enemy, and the *Lombards* that were at beſt but unfaithful friends, he makes what advantage he can

Chronicon. Sigeberti ad A. 728.
Otto Friſing. l. 5. c. 18.
Urſperg. Chron. ad A. 718.
Hier. Rubei hiſtor. Raven. l. 4. p. 150.
Hadr. Valeſ. Rerum Francic. lib. 25. tom. 3. p. 520.

can of the places that owed subjection to the *Emperour*, to make up the *Patrimony* of the *Church*: as *Valesius* observes particularly, of *Sutrium*; but *Sigonius* saith, *the people not only cast off the Emperour, but did swear to be faithful to the Pope*, (no wonder then he was not willing to have a new *Emperour* chosen) *so that at this time* Rome, *and the Roman Dutchy came into the hands of the Pope*, the Cities of which are enumerated by *Sigonius*; and therefore *Papirius Massonus* deservedly makes this *Pope, the founder of the greatness of the Roman Church*: which we see was laid in downright *rebellion*: and can be no otherwise justified, than by making the *Pope* absolute *Governour* of the World. Not long after, the *Pope* begins, saith *Valesius*, a war with the *Lombards*, who watched any occasion to take away some part of his newly gotten *Patrimony*; he therefore sends away *Anastasius* and *Sergius* into *France*, to *Charles Martel*, with the *Keyes* of St. *Peters Sepulchre*, in token of their owning him as their *Protector*. Which Embassie being acceptable to *Charles*, he procures a peace to be concluded between the *Lombards* and the *Romans*: which was contrary to the Popes desire, who sent several Letters and Messengers to him to come into *Italy*, to revenge St. *Peters* quarrel against the *Lombards* with *Fire and Sword*; and as he loved St. *Peter*, he would come with all Speed into *Italy*; as appears by the letters still extant and published by *Sirmondus*. But he soon after dying, his Son *Pepin* succeeding in all his power; and growing weary of having so much as the name

Sigon. de regno Ital. l. 3 ad A.D. 727.

Papir. Massonius de Episcop. urbis. l. 3. p. 126.

Vales. tom. 3. p. 525.

Platina in Gregor. 3.

Sirmondi Concil. Gallic. Tom. 1. p. 526.

name of a *King* above him, sends to *Pope Zachary* to know whether it were not fitter for him to bear the name, who did all the business of a *King*; he very well understood his meaning, and readily assented to it; upon which *Chilperick* was deposed and put into a *Monastery*, and *Pepin* was afterwards absolved by the *Pope* from his Oath of fidelity, with all the Nobles and People. There being now so close a League, between the *Popes* interest and *Pepins*; the ones title to his Crown depending on the *Popes* authority, the others security upon his protection, no wonder to see them endeavour the promoting each others advantage. The *Popes* Territories being not long after molested by *Aistulphus* King of the *Lombards*, *Stephen* writes a very pittiful Letter of complaint to *Pepin*, and *Charles* and *Charlemagne* his Sons; wherein he saith, that *Aistulphus* had almost broke his heart with grief, because he would not leave one foot of Land to St. *Peter* and the *Holy Church*; and therefore he conjures them by St. *Peter*, who had anointed them *Kings*, that they would recover the lands again out of the *Lombards* hands; or otherwise they may think what a sad account they will give to St. *Peter*, in the day of Judgement: These are the words of the *Popes* letter, lately published by *Delaland Sirmondus* his Nephew, in his *Supplement* of the *Gallican Councils*. Upon this, *Pepin* comes to his assistance, and every peace addes still more to the *Churches Revenew*; by which it was now grown very considerable by the spoiles of the *Empire*, the *Exarchat* of *Ravenna* in *Pope Stephans* time being

Otto Frising. Chron. l. 5. c. 22. Pagi. Mason. Annal. Franc. l. 2. p. 86. Sabellic. Encad. 8. l. 8. Blond. decad. 1. lib. 10.

Concilior. Antiq. Galliæ Supplement. p. 78. A. D. 756.

being destroyed, which was the only *remainder* then left of the *Empire* in *Italy*: and the revenews of it were given by *Pepin* to the Church of *Rome*: as appears by an ancient inscription in *Ravenna*, mentioned by *Papirius Massonus*: Which the *Pope* solicited hard for, when he went himself into *France* on purpose to stirr up *Pepin* against the *Lombards*, and was much afraid lest the *Exarchat* should have been restored again to the *Emperour*; but *Pepin* promising to give the Region of *Pentapolis*, and *Ravenna*, to the *Roman See* (assoon as he had taken them from the *Lombards*) the *Pope* went away well satisfied: and drew after him a mighty Army, whereby a great part of *Italy* was laid waste, and the people miserably harrassed; for no other end, but to secure that to the *Pope*, which did by all right belong to the *Emperour*: Who sent *Ambassadours*, first to the *Pope*, and then to *Pepin* to desire the restitution of those places, to their true owner; but the *Pope* denyed, and *Pepin* urged the promise he had already made to the *Pope*, and that he could not go back from it; because he undertook that quarrel meerly for his souls, and the *Popes* sake, without expecting any advantage to himself by it. *Aistulphus* being dead, *Desiderius* takes upon him the *Kingdom* of *Lombardy*, but he fearing *Rachis* the right heir, makes a League presently with the *Pope*; and by surrendring up some *more Cities*, makes him wholly of his party, and *Rachis* is fain to retire again to a *Monastery*: but after a while, *Desiderius* finds an occation to quarrel with the *Pope*, and takes several *cities* into his hands which

Papir. Masson. Annals Franc. l. 2. p. 87.
Sigon. de reg. Ital l. 3. A. 754.
Sirmond. Concil. Tom. 2. p. 12.
Blond. decad. 2. l. 1.
Platin. in Steph. 2.
Adelmus in Franc. Annal. ad A. 755.
Blondus ib. Platina in Stephan. 2.

which the *Pope* had got poſſeſſion of, and threatens ſuddenly to beſiege *Rome*; *Pope Adrian*, finding himſelf in theſe ſtraights, diſpatches away meſſengers with all ſpeed to *Charles* the Son of *Pepin*, that he would imitate his *Father*, and *Grandfather*, in relieving the *Church* of *Rome* in this diſtreſs. *Charles*, not willing to omit ſuch an opportunity of inlarging his Dominions, enters *Italy* with a great Army; and in a little time puts a period to the *Kingdom* of *Lombardy*, which had then laſted in *Italy* 206 years; and was magnificently received at *Rome*, by *Hadrian* and the people; by whom he was choſen *Protector* of the *Roman Church* and ſtate, under the name of *Patritius*; and he being deſired by *Hadrian*, to confirm his Fathers Promiſes to the *Church*, not only doth that, but addes a conſiderable acceſſion, the more firmly to oblige the *Romans*, and eſpecially the Pope to him. *Italy* being thus reduced, nothing was now wanting to *Charles* but the Title of *Emperour*; having already ſo great a dominion in *Italy*, beſides what he had in *Germany* and *France*. This had been often treated on between the *Pope* and him, but the *ſeditions* of *Rome* by the *Emperours party* frequently happening by the preſence of ſome of his Officers there, as *Platina* confeſſeth, and his party being not inconſiderable in other parts, though not daring publickly to appear, and *Charles* by his Warrs being elſewhere employed, this was put off till *Pope Leo* 3, by the conſpiracy of ſome of the chief Citizens of *Rome*, was ſeized on and impriſoned; from whence making

Platina in Steph. 3.

making a difficult escape, he goes in haste to *Charles*, who coming into *Italy* and punishing the conspiratours, the *Pope* then, (some say, *by his own Authority*, of which number *Bellarmin* reckons thirty three Authors, others *by the consent of the Senate and people*) declares *Charles* to be *Emperour of Rome*, and solemnly performs the office of his *Inauguration*. Thus we have seen the *Foundation* laid, of the *Greatness* of the *Roman Church*; which being begun in Rebellion, was carryed on by continual warrs, and so great devastations of the Countrey, that *Platina* and *Blondus* both say, *that the countrey about* Rome, *suffered more in that time, than in all the invasions of the barbarous Nations for 344 years before*. And was not the *Church* like to enjoy much happiness and peace, under a *Government* founded in *Rebellion*, and maintained by *blood?* for we see the *Popes* were the great instruments of casting off their lawful *Prince*, and taking his Territories to themselves; and to maintain what they had unjustly gotten, they never scrupled beginning quarrels, making warrs, calling in any forrain assistance, that might the most serve to promote their designes.

De translat. Imp. Rom. l. 1. c. 4.

Platin. in Steph 2. Blond. decad. 2 lib. 1.

§. 3. It might now be imagined that the *Popes*, having been so highly obliged by *Charlemagne*, should in meer gratitude have done their utmost to preserve the *Empire* in peace, under his posterity; but they are great strangers to the *Court* of *Rome*, who look for any thing there, but what tends to their own advantage. For in the time of *Ludovicus Pius*, son of *Charles the great*, his sons combining together

The disturbances made by Popes, in the new Empire.

gether against him in *France*, the *Pope Gregory* 4. going thither, under a pretence of reconciling them, joynes with the Sons in their Rebellion against their Father. This *Baronius* would have, to be a meer calumny; and endeavours to vindicate the *Pope*, *because* Paulus Æmilius *saith, that the Pope abrogated the Decree, whereby* Ludovicus *was deprived of the Empire*: But *Baronius* understood his business too well, to make use of the Testimony of so late an Author, if he could have had any assistance from those who lived near the time. *Nithardus*, who lived in the same age, and was nearly related to the *Imperial Family*, wrote a Book on purpose, of the differences among the Sons of *Ludov. Pius*; and he expressly saith, *that they drew the Pope into their Party*; which is likewise affirmed by the Author of the life of the said Emperour, who lived at the same time: *the Pope*, he saith, *indeed pretended to reconcile them, but the event shewed it to be otherwise; and the Emperour sent to him to know if he came to him, what made him stay so long before he came at him? and Understanding that he came with a design to excommunicate all that would not joyne with the Sons against the Father*, he said, *that if he came to excommunicate others, he should go away excommunicated himself, because he acted against the Canons. Papirius Massonus*, upon the Testimony of *Nithardus* (whom he calls *Vitaldus*) makes *Gregory* guilty of the conspiracy of the Sons against their Father: and the reason he gives of it is, that *Lotharius*, having the command of *Italy*, might dispossess

Annales Eccles. ad A. D. 833.

P. Æmilius in histor. Franc. p. 54.

Nithard. hist. l. 1. à Petr. Pithæ. ed. in Annal. Franc.

Vita Ludovici Pii à Pithæo ib. p. 245.

Papir. Masson. in vit. Greg. 4.

dispossess him of his seat if he opposed him; and *more*, he saith, *are ready to worship the rising than the setting Sun.* A very worthy excuse for the head of the Church, to encourage the Rebellion of Sons against their *Father*; and him too, who had all his life shewed as much kindness to the *Roman See*, as his Ancestors had done! *Sigebertus Gemblacensis* saith, *that Pope* Gregory *went into* France *being of the party of the Emperours Sons against himself.* And *Hincmarus*, the famous *Bishop* of *Rhemes*, who lived in the time of *Ludovicus* his sons, in his Letter to *Pope Hadrian* 2. saith, *that* Gregory *came into* France *with* Lotharius, *against the Emperours will; and there was no peace in* France *after, as had been before; and that he returned with infamy to* Rome. It would be too large a task, to reckon up particularly all the quarrels, which the *Popes*, after this, did either begin or foment among *Christian Princes*; I shall only at present, single out some of the most remarkable of them, not managed by *Beasts* and *Monsters*, as their own Writers call some of their *Popes*, but persons applauded for their *Wisdome* and *Courage*, in maintaining the dignity of their *See*.

Sigiberti Chron. A.D. 832.

Hincmar. Rhemens. Epistol. p. 577. ed. Cord.

§. 4. Among these, *Gregory* 7. deserves the first place; I meddle not with other things in this life, which *Cardinal Benno* hath writ, (and is very weakly suspected by *Bellarmin*, to have been made by some *Lutheran*; it being first published by a *zealous Papist*) but that which I design, is to shew, that under a pretence of advancing his *Authority* he was the great

Of the quarrels of *Greg.* 7. with the Emperour and other Christian Princes.

great *Boutefeu* of *Christendome*. It is obserued by some Historians that *Henry* 4. then *Emperour* fought sixty two pitched Battails (ten more than ever *Julius Cæsar* fought) and he may thank the *Pope*, for so many opportunities to shew his courage. For he was no sooner well settled in his chair, but he finds a pretence of quarrelling with the *Emperour*; and he had such a spirit of contradiction in him, *that it was enough for any thing to displease him, to hear it was liked by the Emperour and the Bishops*, as *Otto Frisingensis* reports of him. While he was yet but Arch-deacon of *Rome*, *Petrus Damiani*, who was a *Brother Cardinal* with him, describes him as a person of the greatest pride and insolency imaginable, in a letter to *Pope Alexander* 2. and *Hildebrand* his *Arch-deacon*, wherein he calls him, *Sanctum Satanam*, a *holy Devil*; and saith, *that his venerable pride had plowed his back with such severe stripes, that he was able to endure them no longer*: and in another Letter to himself alone, he saith, *that he could not get so much as a good word from him, though he wishes he had served God and St.* Peter *as heartily, as he had served him*: *and that he followed no other Canons, but his Will*: *and his judgement did not follow his own thoughts, but his.* This had been very fair, towards another man; but none of his *fellow Bishops* are matches for him, being *Pope* he cares for meddling with nothing under *Crowns* and *Sceptres*; and those he takes upon him to dispose as freely as his predecessour did, when he said, *All these things will I give thee, only fall down and worship*

urspergens. Chronic. p. 226. marg.

Otto Frising. l. 6. c. 32.

Petr. Damiani Epistol. l. 1. ep. 16.

L. 1. Epist. ad Card. Ep. 8.

worship me: For this was the indispensable condition with him. I shall give a brief account of the affairs of the *Empire*, in his time; chiefly from *Sigonius*, who cannot be suspected for an *Henrician Heretick*, (as some of the *German* Historians are called; only for asserting the just Authority of their Prince, against the *Popes* usurpations) the first thing *Pope Hildebrand* began with, was the business of *investitures*; and at a *Council* in the *Lateran*, he *Decreed*, that *in case any one received investiture from a Lay person, both he that gave, and he that received it, should be excommunicated*; to which he adjoyned a Decree against the *Marriage* of *Clergy-men*, which was no sooner published by his *Legats* in *Germany*, but all the *Clergy* were in an uproar, and charged the *Pope* with contradicting S. *Paul*, and that by this means he made way for all manner of uncleanness; and that they would rather part with their places, than submit to it; and when the *Arch-bishop* of *Mentz* was prevailed with to publish this Decree at *Erford*, the Bishops were so enraged, that the *Arch-bishop* fearing his life dismissed the *Assembly*: the like opposition was made at *Milan*, against *Erlembaldus*; who was there killed, with *Luitprandus*, the only person who submitted to him: the *Pope* highly incensed, excommunicates all the *Bishops*, who sided with the *Emperour*, and forbids the people to communicate with any *Clergy-men* who had *Wives*; but not satisfied with this, he summons the *Emperour*, very Magisterially, to appear before him; and in case of neglect, that he should

Sigonius de regn. Italico l. 9. in Hen. 3. A. D. 1074.

Lambert. Schafnaburg. histor. Germ. A. D. 1074. p. 201. Sigebert. Gemblac. Chron. A. 1074. Matt. Paris in Guil. 1. Annal. Boior. l. 5. p. 564.

be excommunicated. *Henry* instead of appearing calls a *Council* of *Bishops*, who pronounce him an *unlawful Pope*, to which they all subscribed; which message was sent to the *Pope*, before his *Council* could meet; but *Hildebrand* encouraged himself, by the examples of his *Predecessors*, *Gregory* 2. & 3. (who took away the remainder of the Empire from *Leo*) and published a *Bull*, wherein *he deprived the Emperour of his Authority, and absolved all his Subjects from their Allegiance, and forbad any to own him for their Prince*; upon which, a *Rebellion* in the *Empire* followed; only they allowed him time, to make his peace with the *Pope* within the year, before they would choose a new *Emperour*. The poor *Emperour* finding so general a *revolt*, is fain to go into *Italy* without money or retinue; till the *Bishops* of *Milan* and *Ravenna* and *Lombardy*, who held faithful to him, furnished him with both. The *Pope* hearing that, stops his journey into *Germany*, and returns to *Canusium*, a strong place belonging to his dear *Mathildis*, who out of great kindness never parted from him; thither came the *German Bishops* first, and beg their pardon barefoot; the *Pope* puts them severally into Cells, and there feeds them with bread and water; but at last upon promise never to discourse with the *Emperour*, before he had given him satisfaction, (unless it were to perswade him to it) they are dismissed. The *Emperour* now draws near to *Canusium*, and gets *Mathildis*, and two more, of greatest interest with the *Pope*, to intercede for him; but

but all they could prevail with him for, was, that this *servant of servants*, this *follower* of St. *Peter*, even the humble minded *Pope Hildebrand*, admits him within the second wall of the *Town*; where casting off his Royal habit, he was, barefooted in the midst of Winter, to wait for the *Popes* answer; in which posture he continued three dayes together; on the fourth, the *Pope* very graciously sends him word, he might come into his presence. If *Lucifer* himself had sate in the Chair, he would not have denyed him so much courtesie as his *Vicar* shewed him; who after submission to his own terms, and at his feet having begged absolution, absolved him. But the mean carriage of the *Emperour* herein, extremely disobliged the *Italians*, his friends; who began to slight and contemn him for it, and to say he was unworthy the *Empire*, and therefore would choose his *Son* in his room: *Henry* finding himself in this condition, returns to his old friends, who declared the terms null which the *Pope* had forced upon him; the *Pope* finding the *Emperour* resolved to defend his power, sends away two *Legats* into *Germany*, who met the *Princes* at the *Diet* in *Forcheim*; in which, by the approbation of the *Legats*, *Henry* is deposed, and *Rodolphus* of *Suevia* chosen *Emperour*. *Baronius* charges *Helmoldus*, and *Albertus Stadensis*, with falshood in saying that *Greg.* 7. *transferred the Crown to* Rodolphus, *and sent it with the known verse upon it*; but whatever becomes of the *verse*, it seems strange, from *Baronius* his own story, that any one should question the

he deposed by Parliament.

Conciliat. Imperial. Tom. 1. *p.* 238.

Baron. Annales T. decl. A.D 1077. *n.* 40.

thing. For was not his excommunicating *Henry*, the cause of the first defection from him? Did not he absolve the people from their *allegiance?* and after his absolution, when he found *Henry* resolved to maintain his power, did not he send his *Legats* on purpose into *Germany*, with instructions to the *Princes* to take care of the *Empire?* Were not his *Legats* present at all the proceedings, and approved them? How could then the *Pope* have no hand in it? unless it were, that he did not put the *Crown* upon his head himself. But saith *Baronius*, *Gregory, in an Epistle of his, calls* Peter *and* Paul *to witness that he did not know of their choosing* Rodolphus: but he doth not deny, that they proceeded to a new choice *because* Henry *did not keep his terms with him:* he had intimations enough given him, who was likest to be the man; and therefore he need not care any more, than to have a new election: and in the instructions given to his *Legats*, wherein he pretended to Umpire the business between them (after *Rodolphus* had sent his Son as hostage for his fidelity to the *Pope*) he gave them express commands, *that which soever of them should not obey his will, that they should resist him to the death and excommunicate all that adhered to him*; *because* forsooth, *it was the sin of Idolatry to contemn the Apostolick See:* and concludes his Letter with that abominable hypocrisie, *that herein he did not seek his own things, but the things of Jesus Christ.* A way of abusing *Scripture* he had taught his friend *Mathildis*, when she used St. *Pauls* words, in a

Letter

Letter to the *Pope*, to expreſs her *love* to him, that *neither tribulation, nor diſtreſs, nor perſecution, nor famine, nor nakedneſs, nor ſword, nor death, nor life, nor principalities*, &c. *ſhould be able to ſeparate her from the love of St.* Peter *in Chriſt Jeſus our Lord*; whom ſhe meant by St. *Peter* is very eaſie to underſtand, according to the conſtant dialect of this *Pope*, whoſe *Bulls* and *Anathema's* againſt *Princes* ran in St. *Peters* name. But we leave *Baronius* admiring the Providence of *God*, that when *Princes* and *Biſhops* forſook the *Church* of *Rome*, he raiſed up *Agnes* the *Emperours* Mother, againſt her own Son, and *Beatrix* and *Matilda*, of near kindred to the *Emperour*, to ſupport the *Pope* againſt him; and not long after, we find him acknowledging that *Rodolphus* was confirmed by the *Pope*, and *Henry* again excommunicated by him; in the form of which excommunication, extant in *Baronius*, *he deſires all the World to take notice, that it is in the Popes power to take away Empires, Kingdomes, Principalities, Dutchies, Marquiſates, Earldomes, and the poſſeſſions of all men from them, and give them to whom he ſhall think fit.* But doth *Baronius* in the leaſt go about to explain, or mitigate this? no, but inſtead of it, *he complains of the proſperity of the wicked, becauſe* Henry *obtained after this a ſignal victory over* Rodolphus, *in his fourth Battel*, wherein he was wounded in his right hand, and (ſay the *German Hiſtorians*) acknowledged therein the juſt judgement of God being near his death; that being the hand, wherewith he had ſworn fidelity to

Baron. ad A. 1074. *n.* 10.

Ad A. D. 1080. *n. S.* 14.

N. 11.

Helmoldi Chron. Slavorum l. 1. *cap.* 29. *Abbas ur. ſpere ad A.D.* 1080.

to the *Emperour*; and then told his Friends (whatever the *Pope* did swear by *St.* Peter *and St.* Paul) *that the Popes command made him break his Oath, and take that honour upon him which did not belong to him; and he wished they who had put him upon it would consider, how they led men to their eternal damnation by such courses*; which having said, with *great grief of mind*, saith *Helmoldus*, he dyed. And the *Pope* himself, did not escape much better; for the *Emperour* marches into *Italy*, with a great Army; takes in all the Towns, which opposed him; deposes *Hildebrand* by the *Bishops* of his party, as the cause of all the Warr and Bloodshed, and sets up *Gibert* of *Ravenna* under the name of *Clement* 3. besieges *Rome*; and the *Pope*, not trusting the Citizens who soon left him, secures himself in a Castle; from whence escaping to *Salerno*, he not long after there dyes. The only good thing we read of him, is that which *Sigebert* and *Florentius Wigorniensis*, and *Matthew Paris* report of him, from the testimony of the *Bishop* of *Mentz*, that he called, when he was dying, one of his Friends to him, and confessed *that it was through the instigation of the Devil, that he had made so great a disturbance in the Christian world.* Whether they who applaud and admire him in the *Roman Church*, as particularly *Baronius*, (who recommended him as a pattern to *Paul* 5. and rejoyced, to see *a man of his spirit to succeed him*) will believe this or no, we matter not; since there is so apparent evidence, for the truth of the thing. But we not only see, the whole

Sigebert. Chron. ad A.D.1085. Florent. Wigorn. ad A.1084 Matt Paris Histor. Anglic. A.1087.

Aventin. Annal. Boior. l 5. p 581.

Sentent. Cardin. Baronii super excomun. Venet.

whole *Empire* put into a flame, under pretence of this *authority* of the *Pope*, and *Italy* laid waste by it, to so great a degree, saith *Sigonius*, *that Mothers devoured their Children for meer hunger*; but we may find him as busie, though not with equal success, with other *Princes* of *Christendom*. He threatens the *King* of *France* to deprive him (if he did not submit to him) and *that his Subjects should certainly revolt from him, unless they would renounce their Christianity*; which are the words of his *Bull* in *Baronius*: but finding no amendment, the next year he sends another; wherein he tells him, *that if according to his hard and impenitent heart, he did treasure up the wrath of God and St.* Peter, *by the help of God he would excommunicate him, and all that should obey him*: the same year he excommunicates in *Italy*, *Robert Duke* of *Apulia*, *Prince* of the *Normans*, and *Gilulphus Prince* of *Salerno*, and sends an army against them. He threatens *Alphonsus* King of *Spain*, with *the Sword of St.* Peter; he excommunicates *Nicephorus*, *Emperour* of *Constantinople*; he not only deprives *Boleslaus King* of *Poland* of his *Kingdom*, but puts the whole *Kingdom* under an interdict, and *forbids the Bishops anointing any for King, but whom he should appoint*. Of all the Princes of *Christendom*, I find none so much in his favour as our *William*, the first of the *Norman Race*; for he coming into a Kingdom, where he found no interest but what his Sword made him, keeps a fair correspondency with the *Pope*, receives his Decrees, refuses to enter into an alliance against him; which so pleased

Sigon. de regno Ital. l. 9 ad A. 1084.

Baron. Annal. ad A.D. 1073. n. 65.

Id. ad A. 1074. n. 53.

Id. b. n. 32.

Id. ad. A. 1080. n. 48.

Id. A. 1078. n. 15.

Mart. Cromer. de gestis Polon. l. 4. ad fin.

Baron. ad A.D. 1074. n. 5.

ſed him, whom all other Princes hated, that he ſends to him in his diſtreſs, to come to his aſſiſtance, to divert the *Emperour*; and calls him *the Jewel of Princes*, and ſaith that *he ought to be the rule of obedience to all other Princes*; but yet *William* himſelf could not eſcape his threatnings, when he forbad the *Biſhops* of his *Kingdom* to go to *Rome*, and utterly denyed taking any oath of fidelity to the *Pope*, which he preſſed upon him by his *Legat*; although *Baronius* make him to *ſubmit* to the *Pope*, upon the receipt of his letter; whereas the letters of *Lanfranc* and the *King*, produced by himſelf, expreſly contradict it. This we are ſure of, that *William* all his time practiſed that *right of inveſtiture* of *Biſhops* by a *ſtaff and a ring*, which had been the firſt *cauſe* of the quarrel between the *Emperour* and the *Pope*; and which he had ſo ſeverely forbidden in ſeveral *Councils* at *Rome*, thereby to maintain his own authority, by taking off the *Biſhops* of ſeveral *Kingdoms* from any aknowledgement of dependence on their own *Soveraign Princes*; which was the trueſt cauſe of all the quarrels of *Chriſtendom* raiſed and fomented by this *Hell-brand*, as the *Centuriatours* according to their *Dialect* call him.

Id. ad A.D. 1080. n. 45.

Id. A 1079 n. 20.

Eadmer. præfat. ad hiſt. Novor. m.

Of the quarrels his Succeſſours. *Onuphrius in vit. Greg. 7.*

And although *Onuphrius* in his life confeſs, that this *Popes* deſigns if they had taken effect, would have quite overthrown the *Majeſty* of the *Empire*; and that he was the firſt *Pope*, who ever attempted ſuch things: yet he having now ſtarted ſo fair a game, though he dyed in the purſuit of it, his ſucceſſours retrieved it

it and followed it with all their might and skill; thence we read that *Urban*, being made *Pope* by *Hildebrands* faction in opposition to the *Emperour*, renews the sentence of excommunication against him; and in the *Council* at *Piacenza*, not content barely to excommunicate him (in the presence of *Agnes* or *Adelais* the *Emperours* wife) he uttered saith *Urspergensis*, *very reproachful speeches against him:* but he had been no fit successour for *Hildebrand*, who could content himself with bare words; especially, having declared his resolution to follow the steps of so worthy a predecessour: and so he did to purpose, when he set up *Conradus* the *Emperours* Son in Rebellion against his *Father*. This *Baronius* would fain shift off, as not arising from the *Popes* instigation, but some *private discontents*, for which he quotes *Dodechinus*; but *Sigonius*, who follows the same Author, saith expressly, *that he took upon him the Kingdom of* Lombardy *against his Father, by the Authority of* Urban *himself*: and *Bertholdus*, whose testimony is afterwards produced by *Baronius*, *mentions not only their meeting at* Cremona, *but that* Conradus *there took an oath of fidelity to the Pope, and the Pope in requital solemnly promised him to give him all the advice and assistance he could for the obtaining the Kingdom and Empire of his Father.* What is tomenting and encouraging Rebellion in the highest degree, if this be not? And the sentence of deposition of *Conrade* in the *Diet* at *Aken*, *A.D.* 1096. expressly mentions, as the cause of it, his adhering to *Pope Urban* against the *Emperour* his

Sigebert. Gemblac ad A.D. 1088. *Helmold. Chron. Slav. l.* 1. *c.* 30. *Urspergens. chron p.* 235. *Baron. Annales ad A.D.* 1088. *n.* 3. *Aventin. Annal. Boior. l.* 5. *p.* 590. *Baron. A.D.* 1093. *n.* 3. *Sigon. de regno Ital. l.* 9. *A.* 1093. *Bar. ad A.D.* 1095. *n.* 8.

his *Father*; and there his Son *Henry* was declared his successour, and solemnly swears never to Rebel against his *Father*. But notwithstanding this Oath, *Conrad* being dead, this *Son* is likewise prevailed upon by the *Popes* instruments, to Rebel against his *Father*: for *Pascal* 2. succeeding *Urban*, had again excommunicated *Henry* 4. and at a *Council*, called by him in *Rome*, he made all the *Bishops* present, by particular subscription, to Anathematize the *Emperours heresie* (as they were pleased to call it) and to promise obedience to *Paschal* and his Successours, and *to affirm what the Church affirmed, and condemn what she condemns.* Having by this means secured the *Bishops* from adhering to the *Emperours* party, there wanted not *Agents* to solicit his *Son*, to take away his *Crown* from him. And the first thing he did upon his *rebellion* was to Anathematize his *Fathers heresie* (which was keeping the *Empire* in spight of the *Popes*) and to promise obedience to the *Pope* as the *Bishops* had done at *Rome*; and in the *Diet* at *Northausen*, A. D. 1105. *he calls God to witness, that it was no desire of the Empire which made him take his Fathers Government from him; but if he would obey the Pope, he would presently yield himself to him and become his Slave.* And when the *Son* had in a perfidious manner seized on the Person of his *Father*, and he addressed himself to the *Popes Legat* for his safety, he plainly told him, *he must look for none, unless he would publickly declare the justice of* Hildebrand, *and his own unjust persecutions of the Roman See.* But, which is the most evident

Constitut. Imper. Tom. 1. p. 247.

Abbas Ursperg. Chron p. 241.

Ursperg. ib. Baron. ad A. D. 1105 n. 4.

Avent. Annales Boior. l. 5 p. 597.

dent teſtimony of all others in this caſe, *Henry* 4. a little before his death *A. D.* 1106. at *Liege* (whither he was forced to retire by his Sons rebellion) ſends an account of the whole quarrel to *Philip* of *France*; wherein he declares, *that he had offered all reaſonable ſatisfaction to the Pope, only preſerving the authority of the Empire; but this not being accepted, in a moſt unnatural manner, they had armed his moſt beloved Son, his* Abſolom *againſt him; who, by their inſtigation and counſel, had moſt perfidiouſly dealt with him:* but we need not ſo much proof of this, ſince *Baronius* confeſſeth, *that the Son had no greater cauſe of rebelling againſt his Father, than that he was excommunicated by the Pope;* and afterwards very freely delivers his mind, *that in caſe the Son did it ſincerely, as he pretended*, i. e. out of obedience to the *See of* Rome, *it was*, ſaith he, *an act of great piety in him, to be thus cruel to his Father: and that his only offence was, that he did not bind him faſter till he was brought to himſelf*, i. e. to the *Popes* beck. O the admirable doctrine of obedience at *Rome!* What an excellent commentary is this upon the fifth Commandment, and the thirteenth to the *Romans!* What mighty care hath the *Church* of *Rome* alwayes taken, to preſerve *peace* and *unity* in the *Chriſtian Church!* The Hiſtorians who report the paſſages of this time, tell us, *there was never known ſo diſmal an age as that was, for Warrs and Bloodſhed, for Murthers and Parricides, for Rapines and Sacriledge, for Seditions and Conſpiracies, for horrible Schiſms and Scandals to Religion,* the

Conſtitut. Imper. Tom. 3. 318.

Baron ad A. 1106. n. 2. &c.

Id ad A D 1105. n. 6.

Id ad A.D. 1106. n. 14.

Aventin. Annal Boior. l. 5. p. 562.

Si cherti Chron. c. ad A.D. 1074.

the Prieſts oppoſing the Biſhops, the People the Prieſts, and in ſome places not only robbing the Churches, burning the Tithes, but trampling under foot the holy Euchariſt that was conſecrated by ſuch whom Pope Hildebrand *had excommunicated.* And muſt we after all this believe, that the *Roman See* is the *fountain of Unity* in the *Catholick Church*; that all Warrs and Rebellions ariſe from caſting off ſuch ſubjection to the *Popes*, who have been the great fomenters of Rebellion ever ſince *Hildebrands* time, and the diſturbers of the peace of *Chriſtendom?* For we are not to imagine that this quarrel ended with *Henry* 4. for it was revived again in *Henry* the fifth's time between *Pope Paſchal* and him; and the *Pope* grants him the priviledges, which his *Father* contended for; but afterwards revoked his own grant (perjury being no ſin at *Rome*, in ſo holy a cauſe) and raiſed a Rebellion in the *Empire* againſt him; and notwithſtanding ſeveral agreements, made between him and the ſucceſſive *Popes*, could enjoy no laſting peace in his time, upon their account; and dyed at laſt without iſſue, going to ſuppreſs a new Rebellion. After his death, *Conradus* being to ſucceed as Siſters Son to *Henry* 5. *Lotharius* by the arts of the *Court of Rome*, was ſet up in oppoſition to him: he was fain to part with the rights of the *Empire* to ſatisfie the Pope; who made him receive the *Imperial Crown*, at his feet. In the time of *Conradus*, who ſucceeded *Lotharius*, the *Pope* encouraged *Guelfo* the *Duke* of *Bavaria* in a Rebellion againſt him (from whom the

two

two loving factions of *Guelphs* and *Gibellines* had their beginning) It would be endless to relate the *disturbances* of the Christian world, which arose from the contentions of several *Popes*, about their Authority, with *Frederick Barbarossa*, *Philippus Sucvus*, *Otho* 4. *Frederick* 2. *Ludovicus Bavarus*, and other Emperours, till such time as the Majesty of the Empire was lost in *Carolus* 4. or if we should give an account of all the *Warrs*, and *Rebellions*, and *Seditions*, and *Quarrels*, which happened meerly upon *pretence* of the *Papal Authority*, in our own *Nation*, or in *France*, or elsewhere. But these may, at present, suffice to give testimony, what an excellent *instrument* of *Peace* to the *Christian* world, the *Authority* challenged by the *Bishop* of *Rome* hath been: and the same *Authority* is still vindicated and asserted in the *Court* of *Rome*.

§. 6. 2 But although such civil disturbances have happened, by the contentions about the *Papal authority*; yet they may say, *the Church hath had its unity still, as long as they were united in the same Head:* For this they look on, as the *great foundation of Unity*; for say they, *the unity of the body consists in the conjunction of the members with the head, and then with one another: and although there may be many other sorts of Unity in the Church, yet the essential Unity of the Church*, they tell us, *lyes in conjunction of the members under one Head.* But what becomes then of the Unity of the Roman Church, in the great number of *Schisms*, and some of long

Of the Schisms in the Roman Church.

Bellarm. de rotis Eccles. l. 4. c. 10. De Eccles. milit. l. 3. c. 5.

long continuance among them? Were they all members united under *one Head*, when there were sometimes two, sometimes three several *Heads*? *Bellarmine* in his *Chronologie*, confesseth twenty six several *Schisms* in the Church of *Rome*; but *Onuphrius*, a more diligent searcher into these things, reckons up thirty; whereof some lasted ten years, some twenty, one fifty years. And it seems very strange to any one, that hears so many boasts of Unity in the *Church* of *Rome* above others, to find more *Schisms* in that *Church*, than in any *Patriarchal Church* in the World. We should think, if the *Bishop* of *Rome* had been designed *Head* of the *Church* and the *fountain of Unity*, that it was as necessary that *Church* should be freed from intestine divisions on that account, as to be secured from *errours* in faith, if it had the promise of *Infallibility*; for *errours* are not more contrary to *infallibility*, than *divisions* are to *Unity*: and the same *Spirit* can as easily prevent *Schisms*, as *Heresies*. But as the *errours* of that *Church* are the clearest evidence, against the pretence of *infallibility*; so are the *Schisms* of it, against its being the fountain of *Unity*: for how can that give it to the whole *Church*, which so notoriously wanted it in it self? I shall not need to insist on the more ancient *Schisms*, between *Cornelius* and *Novatianus* and their parties, between *Liberius* and *Felix*, between *Damasus* and *Ursicinus*, between *Bonifacius* and *Eulalius*, between *Symachus* and *Laurentius*, between *Bonifacius* and *Dioscorus*, between *Sylverius* and *Vigilius*, and many others.

others. I shall only mention those, which were of the longest continuance in that Church, and do most apparently discover the *divisions of it*. I begin with that which first brake forth in the time of *Formosus*, who was set up *A. D.* 821. against *Sergius*, whom the faction of the *Marquesse* of *Tuscany* would have made *Pope*; but the popular faction then prevailing, *Sergius* was forced to withdraw, and *Formosus*, with continual opposition from the other party, enjoyed the Papacy four years and six months; not without the blood of many of the chief Citizens of *Rome*, slain by *Arnulphus* in the quarrel of *Formosus*. After his death *Boniface 6.* intruded, saith *Baronius*, into the *Papal See*, but was after fifteen dayes dispossessed by *Stephanus 7.* who in a Council called for that purpose, nulled all the acts of *Formosus*, deprived all those of their orders, who had been ordained by him, and made them be *Re-ordained*; and not content with this, he caused his body to be taken out of the Grave, and placed it in the Popes Chair with the Pontifical habits on; where after he had sufficiently reviled him, *that could not revile again*, he caused the three Fingers to be cut off, with which he used to give Benediction and Orders, and the body to be thrown into *Tiber*. This last part *Onuphrius* would have to be a fable, and *Andreas Victorellus* from him; but *Baronius* saith, *they are mistaken who say so*; for not only *Luitprandus*, who lived in that Age, expressly affirms it, (although, he attributes it to *Sergius*, upon whose account the Schism begun:) but the acts of the

Onuphr. Annot. in Plat. vit Formos. Victorel add. ad Ciacon. de vit. Pontif.

Roman

Roman Council under *John* 9. extant in *Baronius* make it evident: and *Papirius Massonius* cites other ancient Historians for it. Upon this nulling the Ordinations of *Formosus*, a great dispute was raised in the Church; for many of the *Bishops* would not submit to re-ordination, and particularly *Leo Bishop* of *Nola*, to whom *Auxilius* writ his Book in defence of the Ordinations of *Formosus*, a short account whereof is published by *Baronius* from *Papyrius Masso*; but the whole Book is now set forth from an ancient Manuscript, by *Morinus*; by which we understand the controversie of that time much better, than we could before. Two things were chiefly objected against *Formosus* his Ordinations. 1. That against the Canons of the Church he was translated from one See to another; being *Bishop* of *Porto*, before he was made *Bishop* of *Rome*. 2. That having been degraded by *John* 8. (although restored by his successour *Marinus*, and absolved from his Oath) he was not capable of conferring Orders. Against the first of these *Auxilius* shews, that translation from one See to another cannot null Ordination, from the testimony of Pope *Anterus*, the example of *Greg. Nazianzen*, *Perigenes*, *Dostheus*, *Reverentius*, *Palladius*, *Alexander*, *Meletius*, and many others. That the *Nicene Canon* against *translations*, was interpreted by the *Council* of *Chalcedon* so as not to extend to all cases, and it was so understood by *Pope Leo* and *Gelasius*; and however, that only nulls the *translation*, and not the *ordination*. Against the second he pleads, that supposing it not to be lawful to

Baron. Annal. ad A.D.897. n.2.3.

Papir. Masson de Episcop. urb.l.3. p.151.

Morinus de Sacris Eccles.ordinat. par.2.p.348.

to remove from one *Episcopal See* to another, yet the Ordination may be valid; for *Formosus* was not not Consecrated again himself, but only reconciled by *Marinus*; that the *Popes*, *Gregory* and *Leo*, had declared against *Re-ordination*, as much as against *Re-baptizing*; that the *Canons* of the *Apostles* had forbidden it; that the Ordinations by *Acacius*, were allowed by *Anastasius*; that the *Bonosiaci*, though Hereticks, had their Orders allowed them; that the *Cathari* were admitted to the Churches Communion by the *Council* of *Nice*, only with imposition of hands; that though *Liberius* fell to the *Arian* Heresie, yet his Ordinations afterwards were not nulled; neither those of *Vigilius*, although he stood excommunicated by *Silverius*, and added Homicide to it: that the nulling these Ordinations was to say in effect, that for twenty years together they had been without the Christian Religion in *Italy*: that none but *Hereticks* could assert these things; that if any *Popes* themselves *speak* or *act* against the *Catholick faith or religion*, they are not to be followed in so doing. This is the substance of the first Book of *Axilius*, which things are more largely insisted upon in the second. But by that Book it appears most evidently, that the Barbarous usage of the body of *Formosus* was most true; it being expressly mentioned therein, and justified by him, in the Dialogue that pleads for *Re-ordination*. And now saith *Baronius*, *began those most unhappy times of the Roman Church, which exceeded the persecutions of Heathens or Hereticks*: but he, out of his constant good

Baron. Annal. ad. A. D. 897. n. 8, 9.

will to civil Authority, layes the fault altogether upon the power of the *Marquesses* of *Tuscany*, who had then too great power in *Rome*; but he strangely admires the providence of *God*, in keeping the *Heads* of the *Church* from *Heresie*, all that time. Alas for them! they did not trouble themselves about any *matters* of *faith* at all, but were wholly given over to all manner of wickedness, as himself confesseth of them; when *Theodora*, that *Mother* of the *Church* of *Rome*, ruled in chief, and her daughter *Marocia's* Son by *Pope Sergius* came to be *Pope* himself; when, as *Platina* saith, *it grew to be the custome of Popes, to null all that their predecessours had done.* Were not these goodly heads of the *Church* the mean time? and did not they keep the *Church* in great *Unity*, under their agreeable conduct? Methinks the providence of *God*, is as much concerned to preserve *holiness* and *peace*, as *faith* in the world; and were not these excellent instruments for doing it! *Baronius* grants *the acts of* Stephanus *to be such, as the most barbarous Nations could not endure to hear of, and are too bad to be believed:* and all the following Age he calls *Iron* for its rust and barrenness, and *leaden* for its badness and dulness; and confesseth *that Monsters of impurity then raigned in the Apostolical See, that infinite evils sprung from thence, and horrible Tragœdies, and mischiefs not to be spoken of.* And yet a very *Catholick faith*, and the *Unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace* must be supposed to be there infallibly all this while; but if all their faith and unity be of such a kind as was in the 10 *Century* in the *Roman Church*;

Platina in vit. Steph. 6.

Ad. A. D. 900. n. 1.

Church; I ſhould think *Baronius* might have ſaid more in admiration of the providence of *God*, in preſerving the *Catholick faith* and *Unity* among the *Devils* in Hell! for the *Scripture* tells us, *they believe and tremble*; and our Saviour ſaith, *that the Devils Kingdom cannot ſtand, if it be divided againſt it ſelf*; and theſe are clearer and ſtronger teſtimonies, than can be brought of the *faith* and *Unity* of the *Roman Church*; when ſuch horrid wickedneſs is acknowledged to have had Dominion in it, and that Church had this diſadvantage of the *Devils Kingdom*, that it was *divided againſt it ſelf*: In the very beginning of this *Century*, Pope *Stephen* is caſt into Priſon, and there ſtrangled, as *Baronius* proves from his *Epitaph*; and now the *Roman faction* prevailing, they make one *Romanus* Pope, the firſt and only thing he did, was to condemn all that *Stephen* had done, as *Platina*, *Onuphrius*, and *Ciacconius* all agree; but he continued not much above four months; after him *Theodorus*, who held out about twenty dayes, and followed the ſteps of *Romanus*; to him ſucceeded *John* 10. (as *Platina* calls him) of the ſame faction, who ſet all *Formoſus* his *Acts* to rights again, condemning all that *Stephen* had done in a *Council* at *Ravenna*; whither he was driven by the prevalency of the faction at *Rome* againſt him; where in the preſence of ſeventy four Biſhops, the Acts of the *Council* under *Stephen* were burnt, in which the Ordinations of *Formoſus* were nulled; and *Sergius*, *Benedictus*, and *Marinus* were *Anathematized*, for being inſtruments in the Acts againſt *Formoſus*. N. 6.

Formoſus. The next Pope *Benedict* eſcapes without any thing, but a dull Epitaph; but *Leo* his ſucceſſour had not been above forty dayes in the place, but he is caſt into Priſon, by one of his ſervants, who is made *Pope* in his place, and ſeven months after he is ſerved the ſame way by *Sergius*, who now at laſt recovered the *Popedom*; and the greateſt thing he did was to condemn *Formoſus* again, and all who had appeared for him: ſo that now, as *Sigebert* ſaith, nothing was talked of ſo much as *ordinations*, and *exordinations*, and *ſuperordinations*, by the contrary *Acts* of theſe *Popes* to one another. *Baronius* confeſſeth *this* Sergius *to have been a man of a moſt infamous and diſſolute life*: after his death, *Theodora* was not at reſt till ſhe had gotten her *Gallant* to be *Pope* under the name of *John* 11. *and what manner of Cardinals*, ſaith *Baronius*, *may we imagine ſuch a Pope would make?* But *Marozia* her daughter was not ſo well pleaſed with him; for by her order, his *Brother* was killed in his preſence, and he put into priſon, and there ſmothered. After him, ſaith *Luitprandus*, *her own Son by Pope* Sergius, *is made Pope*; who was caſt into Priſon, by his Brother *Albericus*; who being not pleaſed with *Stephen*, who followed him, he was ſet upon and ſo wounded and deformed thereby, that he durſt not let his face be ſeen; and the ſeditions, ſaith *Platina*, continued ſo high in his time, that he could do no great thing. At laſt, *Alberic's* Son, called *Octavianus*, got poſſeſſion of the See, under the name of *John* 13. (or 12. as others beſides *Platina* call him) who was ſuch a

Baron. A. 908. n. 3.

A. D. 912. n. 14.

A. D. 928. n. 2.

Luitprand. hiſt. l. 3. cap. 12.

Baron. ad. A. 933. n. 1.

Monſter

Monster for all wickedness, that *Otho* the *Emperour* was called into *Italy* to displace him; who called a *Council*, wherein he was accused *for ordaining a Deacon in a Stable, and making a Bishop of ten years of age*; but these were small faults *to his Adulteries, Sacriledge, Cruelties, drinking healths to the Devil; and at Dice calling upon the Devils for help.* When these accusations were sent to him from the *Council*, he only threatned to excommunicate them all, if they chose another *Pope* against him: but they not regarding his threatning depose him, and choose *Leo* 8. in his place. Here *Baronius* storms unreasonably, *that a Council should take upon it to depose a Pope, though so abominably bad*, as he confesseth this man to have been; and *makes them guilty of an intolerable Errour and Heresie in so doing, because it implyes their believing that the power of the Keys did depend on the worth of the person: and therefore he detests* Leo *as a Schismatical Pope.* And to make sure of a *Schisme*, after the infamous death of *John* 13. being killed in the act of Adultery, the opposite faction in *Rome* chose *Benedict* 5. to succeed him, who was carried away prisoner by *Otho* into *Germany*; but before his death *John* 13. called a *Council*, wherein he nulled all the *Acts* of the other *Council*, and pronounced them *Schismaticks*; *and decreed, that all that were ordained by them must be re-ordained.* Is not here now a most admirable *Unity* in the Roman Church? After *Leo*, another *John* is chosen by the *Emperours* party, but, as *Platina* saith *it being now grown customary to depose Popes,*

Baron. A.D. 903. n. 15.

N. 27, 28, &c.

N. 33.

A 964 n. 7.

they drive him away by ſeditions againſt him, being firſt impriſoned by Rottredus *and then expelled the City.* But they ſuffered ſufficiently for it, by the ſeverity of *Otho* againſt them. ——The next Pope, *Benedict 6.* was caſt into Priſon by the other *faction*, and there ſtrangled, or famiſhed. *John 14.* came to his end after the ſame manner, dying in Priſon, by the faction of *Fernucius* the *Father* of *Boniface 7.* who was driven away from *Rome* after his being made *Pope*; after whom, *Benedict 7.* was ſet up; and *John* ſucceeding him, *Boniface's* faction recovering again, he was for a few months reſtored to the *Popedome*. Againſt *Greg. 5.* the faction of *Creſcentius* ſet up one *Joh. 17.* who by the power of the *Emperour* was deprived of his eyes and the Popedome together, and a little after of his life. Methinks it very pleaſant, in the midſt of all the villanies and Deviliſh enmities which theſe Popes practiſed towards one another, to ſee *Baronius* ſo gravely admiring their Orthodoxneſs.

But theſe *factions* in *Rome*, did not end with this *Century*; for in the next, *A. D.* 1044. we find a new *Schiſm* breaking out on the account of them. We are contented to take the ſtory, as *Baronius* relates it in that year. *Benedict 9.* was made Pope, by the faction of the *Counts* of *Tuſculum* (*Fraſcati*) out of oppoſition to which, and diſlike of *Benedict*, the people of *Rome* depoſed him, and ſet up *Sylveſter 3.* who got the *Popedome* by *Simony*, and enjoyed it but three months; when (the *Tuſculan faction* again prevailing) *Sylveſter* was depoſed, and *Benedict* reſtored;

restored; but finding himself hateful to the people, he *resigns* to *John* (called *Greg. 6.*) or as *Platina* saith some affirm, *sold it to him*. *Otto Frisingensis* saith, *these three sat together in the City of* Rome, *and all of them led very bad lives, as he heard himself at* Rome. But *Baronius* will not have *Greg. 6.* to be the same with *John*, one of the *Schismatical Popes*, but *Gratian*, who, by fair offers (not to be called *Symony*) perswading the other three to part with their places, got the possession of the *Popedome* alone. *Alphons. Ciacconius* follows *Onuphrius*, in saying that his name was *Joh. Gratianus*, but not one of the *three Anti-Popes* sitting together; wherein neither *Baronius*, nor he, can sufficiently clear themselves. If he were distinct, there must be five *Popes* at the same time; for this *Greg. 6.* was deprived with the rest by a *Council*, called by the *Emperour Hen. 3.* at *Sutrium*. For *Baronius* is very much mistaken in saying, that the other three *Popes* were all deprived two years before; for his own Author *Hermannus* asserts, *that the cause of the false Popes was there diligently discussed*, and *Greg 6.* deprived for *Simony*, and *Ciaccounus* expressly saith, after other Authors; (however *Baronius* strives to vindicate him, out of kindness to his name sake and Disciple *Greg. 7.*) and *Clement 2.* is there made *Pope*, who enjoyed it but a little time, *being poisoned*, saith Platina *by* Damasus 2. *who succeeded him*; but after the death of both these, *Benedict 9.* got into possession of the Papacy again, and the fifth time after the death of *Leo 9.* in whose

time a great controverſie aroſe again about *Re-ordination*, *viz.* of ſuch who had been ordained by *Simoniacal perſons*: and although *Leo* had determined in Council, *that upon forty dayes penance, they might perform the duties of their function*; yet it appears by an Epiſtle of *Petrus Damiani*, extant in *Baronius*, that this Controverſie remained ſtill, and *they thought all actions done by ſuch perſons, no other than if they had been done by Lay-men*; but we find nothing done in it to ſuppreſs this *hereſie*, as he calls it, although he earneſtly deſires the *Pope* to condemn it. We are now fallen into the times of *Hildebrand*, who cauſed *Benedict* 10. to be deprived of the *Papacy*, before he came to it himſelf; for he called together the diſcontented Cardinals at *Siena*, where they diſcarded *Benedict*, and choſe *Nicolaus* 2. The *Schiſme* that happened in his own time, I have already ſpoken to, which I ſhall therefore paſs by; as likewiſe the others, that followed upon the oppoſition between the *Popes* and *Emperours*; although it is not to be imagined, that there could be greater diviſions among men, than were upon the account of thoſe two *factions*; eſpecially, after they came to be diſtinguiſhed by the names of *Guelphs* and *Gibellines*; it being ordinary for them to murder each other whereever they met, for a mighty demonſtration of the *peace* and *unity* of the *Roman Church*.

Baron. An. ad A. D. 1052. n. 6.

I ſhall only now enquire, whether all theſe *Schiſms* and *Factions* happened among them, only on the account of the differences between the

the *Popes* and *Emperors*; and we ſhall find, that the agreement among themſelves was only from that external oppoſition; and when that ceaſed, new *Factions* and *Schiſms* brake forth among them. Of which *Italy* was ſo full, that the election of *Popes* became the work of years, by reaſon of the heats which were among them: But I meddle not with theſe factions in elections although they are no great indications of the preſence of the *Holy Ghoſt* among them. But I ſhall only touch at the greateſt *Schiſm*, for continuance, they ever had among them (as their *Hiſtorians* reckon it) which laſted with great animoſities, for fifty years together; in which all the Princes of Chriſtendom were concerned, and one party was always condemning the other with the greateſt bitterneſs, and condemning all the acts done by the other, and pronouncing them *null* and void. This was begun, upon the election of *Urban 6.* at which the *Cardinals*, declaring a force by the Souldiers & people of *Rome* when they were withdrawn from thence to a place of ſafety, choſe another Pope, *viz. Clem. 7.* who ſate in *France*, as *Urban* and his Succeſſors did in *Rome*; he made twenty ſeven *Cardinals*, and *Petrus de Luna*, or *Benedict. 13.* ſucceeded him; and notwithſtanding all the endeavours could be uſed to ſuppreſs this *Schiſm*, it ſtill continued; and the means for that end, did rather increaſe it; as the *Council* of *Piſa*, which inſtead of two *Popes* made three, ſetting up *Alexan. 5.* beſides *Greg. 12.* and *Benedict. 13.* and after him *John 23.* was choſen at *Bononia*: and although afterwards the *Council* of *Conſtantine* deprived

John

John 23. and *Benedict* 13. and chose *Martin* 5. yet *Benedict* never yielded; and after his death, the *Cardinals* that were with him chose *Clem.* 8. against *Martin* 5. who were so far from yielding him to be true Pope, that they rather chose to rot in Prison, as they did; and so saith *Ciaconius*, *This Schism was ended after fifty two years, which had given so great disturbance to the whole Christian World.* One might have imagined now, when *Councils* were called for that purpose, that an end should thereby be put to these *Schisms* among them; but it was so far otherwise, that we find another *Schism* begun in that Church not long after, by the *Authority* of the *Council* of *Basil* which chose *Felix* 5. in opposition to *Eugenius* 4. where there was not onely *Pope* against *Pope*, but *Council* against *Council* too; *Eugenius* sitting at that time with the *Council* of *Florence*. In the time of *Julius* 2. we find *Council* against *Council* again, that at *Pisa*, and the *Lateran* at *Rome*, both called *General Councils*, and condemning each other. By which we see, how far the *Church* of *Rome* is from being free from dangerous *Schisms* in it self; and therefore hath no cause to object them to others. The only thing pleaded, in answer to this charge of their numerous *Schisms*, is, that these were most of them Controversies concerning *elections* of *Popes* (which is all the *salvo Molanus* hath for it, at the end of *Onuphrius* his *Chronologie*) but what is that to the purpose? since the Question was, which of them was the *Head* of the *Church*, *with whom the members were to be united?* and all those who were not

Alphons. Ciacon. vit. Pontif. in Clem. 7.

not united with him whom they account *the true Head*, muſt be as much in *Schiſm*, as they who renounce all ſubjection to the *Pope*. For are not thoſe as much in Rebellion, who ſet up an *Uſurper* againſt their *lawful Prince*, as they who deny him to be their *Prince*, and to have any authority over them, becauſe they look on themſelves as a *Free-State*? There can be but *one* lawful *Head of the Church*, by their own principles; and only they are truly united to the *Church*, who are in conjunction with the *lawful Head*; and therefore it follows upon their own principles, that they muſt be in a *ſtate* of *Schiſm*, who are united with any other than the *true Head*. What then ſignifie the boaſts of *Unity* in the *Roman Church*, if they cannot prevent the falling of their members into ſuch dangerous *Schiſms*? To what purpoſe is it, to tell us of *one Head of the Church, to whom all muſt ſubmit*, if there have been ſeveral pretenders to that *Headſhip*, and the *Church* hath been a long time divided, which of them was the true? Unleſs all their *Unity* comes to this at laſt, that they have an excellent *Unity* among them if they could all agree: And ſuch an *Unity* may be had any where. But if all were agreed, what need any means of agreement by *one univerſal Head*? or what can that *univerſal Head* ſignifie to making *Unity*, when his title to his *Headſhip* becomes a cauſe of greater diviſions? May not we ſay upon better grounds, that taking away the Popes authority would tend much more to the peace of the *Church*, ſince that hath been the cauſe of ſo great diſturbances

in

in the world, and is to this day of one of the greatest differences between the several parts of the *Catholick Church*? For as things now stand in the *Christian World*, the *Bishop* of *Rome* is so far from being the *Fountain* of *Unity*, that he is much rather the *Head* of *Contention*, and the great cause of the *divisions* of the *Christian Church*.

Of the differences in the Roman Church, about matters of Government.

§. 7. 3. The differences have been as great in the Roman Church, as out of it; both as to *matters* of *order*, and *doctrine*.

(1.) *For matters of Order and Government*; Have not the controversies between the *Regulars* and *Seculars*, among them even here in *England*, been managed with as much heat and warmth, as to matter of *Episcopal jurisdiction*, as between those of the *Church* of *England*, and the dissenters from it? Neither is this any lately started controversie among them, but hath continued ever since the prevalency of the *Mendicant Fryers*, and their pretences of exemptions from *Episcopal jurisdiction*, and encroaching upon the office of the *Parochial Clergy*. For no sooner did the *Fryers* begin publickly under pretence of priviledges, to take upon them to preach, *without licence from the Bishops*, where they pleased, and to take other offices of the *Parochial Clergy* out of their hands, but great opposition was made against them, by all the learned men who were friends to the *Episcopal power*, and the peace of the *Church*. Which being a matter of concernment for us to understand, I shall give a faithful account of it, from the best Writers of their own Church. Assoon

as

as the *Monaſtick Orders* were found to be very ſerviceable to the *Intereſt* of the *Court* of *Rome*, it was thought convenient to keep them in an immediate dependance upon the *Pope*, in what ever Countrey they were. From hence came the great favour of *Popes* to them, and their willingneſs to grant them almoſt what priviledges they deſired; becauſe receiving them only from the *plenitude* of the *Popes power*, they were obliged to maintain and defend that from whence they derived them. At firſt, when they led a more properly *Monaſtick life*, the *priviledges* granted them ſeem to be nothing elſe, but exempting them from ſome troubles which were inconſiſtent with it; either relating to their perſons, or the eſtates they enjoyed. After this, they began to complain of the numbers of people flocking to their *Churches*, as inconſiſtent with their private and retired life; from hence we firſt read that publick *Maſſes* by the *Biſhop* were forbid in *Monaſteries*, to prevent a concourſe of people, and eſpecially of Women to them. But a long time after this they lived in ſubjection to the *Biſhops*, and meddled no more in *Eccleſiaſtical* than in *Secular matters*. So *Charles M.* in his *Capitular*, *commands them to keep within their Monaſteries, to be ſubject to their Biſhops, and to meddle in no Eccleſiaſtical matters, without the expreſs command of the Biſhop*. But as the *Popes* increaſed their authority, the *Monks* inlarged their priviledges, and procured exemptions from *Epiſcopal juriſdiction*; which yet was not pleaſing to thoſe, who valued the *Churches* peace above the pri-

Gregor. l. 4. Epiſt. 43. Caroll. M. Capitular. l. 5. c. 25.

priviledges of the *Monastick* Orders. Their exemptions are therefore highly condemned by S. *Bernard*, though a *Monk* himself, *as tending to the dissolution of the Ecclesiastical Government*; and by *Ivo Carnotensis*, who saith, *he grew weary of his Episcopal Government, by reason of them.* *Petrus Blesensis*, hath an Epistle written to Pope *Alexander* 3. in the name of *Richard Archbishop of Canterbury*, against the *Abbot of Malmsbury*, who refused subjection to the *Bishop* of *Salisbury*, and being cited by the *Archbishop* to appear before him for his contempt, he declared he would be subject to none but the Pope; and said, *they were pitiful Abbots, who did not wholly exempt themselves from the Bishops power, when they might for an annual pension to the* Pope *obtain an absolute exemption.* Therefore the *Archbishop* saith, *it was time for them to complain, because this Contagion did spread it self far, and the Abbots set themselves against their Bishops and Metropolitans: and the* Popes *by indulging these things, did command disobedience and Rebellion, and arm the Children against their Fathers*; but these and many other complaints signified nothing in the *Court* of *Rome*, as long as their profit and interest were advanced by it. And although we read of many affronts which the *Monks* put upon the *Bishops*, before the time of the *Mendicant Fryers*, yet their insolency grew the highest, when they took upon them to *preach* in *Parochial Churches*, and hear Confessions without the *Bishops* leave. Thence the *University* of *Paris*, published the Book *De periculis novissimorum temporum*; which although

Bernard. Epist. 42. ad Hen. Senon. De consider. l. 3. c. 4. Ivo Carnot. Ep. 29. & 276. Petri Blesens. Ep. c. 8.

although written by S. *Amour*, went abroad in the name of all the *Divines* there, as appears by the beginning of it: wherein a Character is given of those persons, who should make *the last times so troublesome*, "they *should* "*be lovers of themselves*, not enduring reproof, "*covetous* both of riches and applause, *high-* "*minded*, because they would not be in sub- "jection to the *Bishops*, but be set before them: "and therefore *disobedient* to their spiritual "Fathers. And such as these are said to *creep* "*into houses*, which the ordinary *Gloss* expounds "of those who enter into the houses of those "who are under anothers charge: these en- "ter not *by the door*, as *the Rectors* of Churches "do; but steal into them like *Thieves* and "*Robbers*, and *leading captive silly women*, is "their setting them against the *Bishops*, and per- "swading them to a Monastick life. These are "likewise *false Teachers*, who though never "so learned and holy, teach without being "sent; and none are duly sent, but such as are "chosen and authorized by the *Church*, such "as *Bishops* and *Presbyters* are; the one succeed- "ing the *Apostles*, the other the 72 *Disciples*: "and afterwards they deny, that the *Pope* him- "self can give any power to others, to meddle "in the charge of a *Parish*, or in *Preaching* "among them, but where they are invited to "it; because *Bishops* themselves cannot other- "wise act out of their own *Dioceses*; and that "the *Pope* in this case doth injury, by viola- "ting the rights of others: and if he should "go about to destroy what the *Prophets* and "*Apostles*

De periculis noviss. temporum. p. 18. *Cap.* 2.

"*Apostles* have taught, he would err in so
"doing. Besides, say they, if these *Prædicant*
"*Fryers* have a liberty to preach where they
"please, they are all *universal Bishops*; and be-
"cause maintenance is due to all who preach,
"the people will be bound to pay *procurations*
"to them, which will be an unreasonable bur-
"den upon them. Many other Arguments they
"use against this new sort of *Itinerant Preachers*,
"and represent the dangers that came to the
Cap. 3. "*Church* by them at large: wherein they de-
"scribe them, as a kind of *hypocritical Secta-*
"*ries*, that abused the people under a fair
"shew and pretence of *Religion*; having, as
"they say, *a form of godliness, but denying the*
"*power of it*: and that the persecution of the
"*Church* by them, would be equal to what it was
"by *Tyrants* and open *Heretick*s; because they
"are familiar enemies, and do mischief under
"a shew of kindness. And that one of the great
"dangers of the Church by them would be,
Cap. 4. "their *possessing Princes and people with prejudices*
"*against the Government of the Church by the*
"*Bishops*; which, having done, they can more
"easily lead them into errors, both against
"faith, and a good life. That their way of
Cap. 5. "dealing is first with the *women*, and by them
"seducing the men, *as the Devil first tempted*
"Eve *and by her* Adam; and when they have
"once seduced them, they tye them by oathes
"and vows, not to hearken to the counsel of
"their *Bishops*, or those who have the care of
Cap. 9. "their souls. That the *Bishops* ought to suppress
"these, and call in the publick help to do it,
"and

" and to purge their *Dioceſes* of them: and that
" if they do it not, *the blood of the people will* Cap. 10.
" *be required of them*, and deſtruction will come
" upon them for it: and though *Princes* and Cap. 11.
" people had taken their part, that ought not
" to diſcourage them; but their folly ought
" to be made manifeſt to all men. After this, Cap. 12.
" they lay down the means to be uſed for ſup-
" preſſing them, and the ſignes for their diſ-
" covery; ſaying, that *they are idle perſons, buſie*
" *bodies, wandring beggars*, againſt the *Apoſtles* Cap. 13.
" expreſs command, who would have all ſuch Cap 14.
" excluded the *Church* as *diſorderly livers*: and
" therefore conclude, with an earneſt exhor-
" tation to all who have a care of the *Church*,
" to riſe up againſt them, as the pernicious
" enemies of its peace and welfare. All theſe
things, which are only ſummarily comprehen-
ded in that Book, are very largely inſiſted up-
on by *Gul. de Sancto Amore*, in another Book
entituled, *Collections of Holy Scripture*, which
is wholly upon this ſubject. The *Mendicant*
Fryers being thus aſſaulted, endeavoured to
defend themſelves as well as they could, and
made choice of the beſt wits among them, for
their Champions; ſuch as *Bonaventure*, and
Aquinas then were, who undertook their
cauſe; and were fain to ſhelter themſelves,
under the *plenitude of the Popes power*; by
which means, they were ſure to have the *Pope*
on their ſide; but his *Authority* was here no
means of *Unity*, for the controverſie continu-
ed long after, and was managed with great
heat, on both ſides.

Of the insufficiency of the Popes authority for ending this Controversie.

§. 8. Upon the great complaint, of the *priviledges* and *exemptions* which the *Monastick orders* had obtained from the *Popes*, *Clement* 5. promised to have this business discussed, in the *Council* of *Vienna*; and to that end, gave order to several learned men to write about it; among whom particularly *Durandus Mimatensis* writ a large discourse (not mentioned by *Possevin*) but Printed *A. D.* 1545. "wherein he perswades the *Pope*, to revoke all such exemptions, because they were contrary to the ancient *Canons* of the *Church*; whereby, from the Apostles times, all places and persons whatsoever were immediately under the jurisdiction of the *Bishops*; and that the *Pope* neither ought, nor could change this order of the *Church*. Because the order of *Bishops*, being appointed to prevent *Schisms* in the *Church*, it could not attain its end, if any persons were exempted from their jurisdiction. And if it were in the *Popes* power to grant such exemptions, it were by no means expedient to do it; because the order of the *Church* would be destroyed by it, the *Bishops* contemned, and the Church divided; and if the *Monastick* Orders paid no obedience to the *Bishops*, the people would soon learn by their example, to disobey them too. And supposing it had been expedient before, it could not be so then; because, though the *Monastick orders* were founded in a *state of poverty*, yet now those who were in them were arrived at such a height of intolerable pride and arrogance, that not only their *Abbots* and *Priors*,

"*Priors*, but the *Fryers* thought themſelves "equal to *Biſhops*, and fit to be preferred be- "fore other *Eccleſiaſtical perſons*. Thus far *Durandus*: and *Ægidius Romanus* at the ſame time writ a Book, againſt the *Exemptions* of *Fryers*; Againſt both of them, *Jacobus* the *Abbot* of the *Ciſtercians* writt a defence of *Exemptions*; which was publiſhed in *Vienna*, in the time of the *Council*. This matter was hotly debated in that *Council*, but the *Pope* would not yield to the *revocation* of them: but renews a *Bull* of *Boniface* 8. for qualifying and *clementin.* compoſing the differences, that had happened *l. 3. c 2.* to the great ſcandal of the *Church* about them: "wherein he takes notice of ſeveral *Bulls* be- "fore, which had taken no effect (ſo excellent "an inſtrument of peace is the *Popes Autho- "rity*) and that of a long time, a *moſt grievous* "*and dangerous diſcord* had been between the "*Biſhops* and *Parochial Clergy*, on one part; "and the *Preaching Fryers*, on the other. "Therefore the Pope very wiſely conſidering, "*how full of danger*, *how prejudicial to the* "*Church*, how *diſpleaſing to God*, *ſo great a diſ-* "*cord was*; and reſolving, wholly to remove "it for the future, by his Apoſtolical authority "doth appoint and command, that the *Fryers* "ſhould have liberty to Preach in all *Churches*, "Places, and publick Sreets at any other "hour, but that wherein the *Biſhops* did Preach, "or did command others to Preach, with- "out a particular licenſe to Preach then: A greater inſtance of the diſcords which have been in the *Roman Church*, nor of the inſuffi-

ciency of the *Popes* Authority for the cure of them, can hardly be produced, than this is. The *Popes* were forced to ſay and unſay, and retract their own grants, to mitigate and qualifie them and all to no purpoſe; for the differences continued as great, notwithſtanding them. The firſt *Pope*, who interpoſed in this quarrel, was *Gregory* 9. who upon complaint made by the *Fryers*, of the *Biſhops* exerciſing their *juriſdiction* over them in ſeveral things, mentioned as *grievances* by them; he publiſhes two *Bulls* or *decretal Epiſtles*, to forbid the *Biſhops* doing it for the future: upon this the *Fryers* openly contemn the *Biſhops*, and Preach where they pleaſe, and hear confeſſions, and bury the dead in ſpight of them, and the *Parochial Clergy*. *Innocent* 4. finding how neceſſary their help was to him, in the Controverſies between him and the *Emperour*, confirms the ſame *priviledges* to them: by which they grew ſo inſolent, that they called the *Pariſh Prieſts*, as *Matthew Paris* relates, *Ideots*, *Dunces*, *Drunkards*, *Blind guides*, and would make the people believe, that all *knowledge* and *ſanctity* was only among them: inſomuch, that in *Petrus de Vineis*, who lived in that *Age* and was *Chancellour* to the *Emperour*, we read a miſerable complaint of the Parochial *Clergy* againſt the Fryers, *viz.* that *by their means they were brought under the greateſt contempt, to the general ſcandal of Religion; they expreſſing the moſt bitter hatred againſt them imaginable, reproaching their lives, and leſſening their dues ſo, as they were brought to nothing by it; and they were made*

Gregor. decret. Epiſtol. l.5 n.31. c.16,17.

Matth. Paris. A.D. 1235. p. 419.

Petrus de Vineis epiſtol. lib.1. ep.37.

made a laughing stock, to all people; that they took away the main of their imployment from them; and drew away the People from the Churches to the Convents, telling them the word of God was to be heard only among them. That they had nothing now left to do, but to pull down their Churches; in which they had scarce any thing left, besides a Bell and an old rusty Image; but these holy Fryers, while they had nothing, possessed all things, and professing poverty were extreamly rich. But *Innocent* 4. a little before his death, being wearied by the complaints of the *Bishops* and *Clergy*, revoked the priviledges which he had so largely granted to the *Fryers*, and confined them within certain limits; *forbidding them, to draw away the people from their Parish Churches, upon Sundayes and Holy-dayes; or to admit any to penance, who had not first confessed to their Parish-priest:* but the *Fryers* were as far from being pacified by this, as the *Clergy* were by the former; for therein the *Pope* upbraids them, *with violating the rights of others, with blaspheaming Religion by such actions, displeasing God, and drawing the souls of the faithful to perdition*: but he dying, assoon as they had notice of this *Bull*, they said, it was a just judgement of God upon him, for revoking their priviledges. And *Alexander* 4. was no sooner setlled in his Chair, but they procured another *Bull* from him, to call in that of *Innocent* 4. and immediately to suspend all execution of it; but this did not satisfie them, for they boasted they had killed *Pope Innocent* by their *Prayers*, and that they

Seculum quintum Universit. Paris. p. 271.

V. Mary, every time they invocated her name, turned to her Son and said, Son hear them: upon which *Innocent* was presently struck with a *Palsie* and dyed; from whence arose a saying in the *Court* of *Rome*, *from the Fryers Letanies good Lord deliver us.* This is related as true by *Bzovius*, *ad A. D.* 1254. but is looked on as a fable of the *Fryers*, by *D'attichy*, *Raynaldus*, du *Boulay* and others of any judgement among them. But neither this *Bull* of *Alexander*, nor all the rest he made for their sakes, could make the *Bishops* and the *Clergy* give up their *rights*; for in the time of *Martin* 4. the *Fryers* procured another *Bull*, for *hearing Confessions without license from the Bishops*; upon which, the contention increased between the *Bishops* and the *Fryers*; insomuch, that not waiting the *Popes* revocation of his grant, which he was inclined to by the perswasions of the *Bishop* of *Amiens*, they called a *Synod* of the *Gallican Church* at *Paris*, *A. D.* 1284. wherein the *Arch-Bishop* of *Bourges* being president, declared to them, "that being *Pastors* of the flock, they ought "to lay down their lives for their sheep, and "not to suffer the encroachments were made "upon them by the *Fryers*; by whom all "things were brought to *confusion* in the "*Church*: that they had used all fair wayes "of prevailing with them, by the intreaties "of the *King* and *Nobles*, to forbear such "intrusions into their offices, as they were "continually guilty of; but all to no purpose, "they still defending themselves by *Papal privileges*; whereas there had been contrary

"*Bulls*

D'attichy hist. Cardinal. Tom. 1. vit Sinibaldi. Rainald. ad A. D. 1254. n. 73. Boulay. histor. univers. Paris. tom. 3 p. 176. Id. p. 462.

Bulls to one another granted at *Rome*. And it was then agreed among them, that they should maintain their *own office* against the *Fryers* incroachments; by which the *contention* increased to so great a height, that many *invectives*, *Apologies*, and *libels* were published one against another, *to the great disgrace* (saith *Meyerus*) *of the whole Ecclesiastical Order*. Upon which, Pope *Martin* endeavoured an accommodation by another *Bull*, wherein he required, *that all Parishioners should Confess to their own Parish Priest, at least once a year*. But this was as far from making peace, as any before; therefore from *Boniface* 8. the *Fryers* procured a new *Bull* of *priviledges*, "which absolutely nulls all the "former *Bulls* of restriction and limitation; and "by the fulness of his Apostolical power, doth "exempt them from all manner of power or "jurisdiction of the *Bishops*, or any other *Ec-* "*clesiastical persons*; and decrees, that they "were immediately subject to the *Pope*, and "to none else. And yet this *Pope* himself, not many years after, retracted this *Bull*; and set forth that, which *Clement* 5. renewed in order to the composing this difference; which had now, to the great demonstration of their *Unity* and the *Popes Authority*, continued with great violence above fifty years: and was far from being ended by this *Bull*; for *Benedict* 11. in another, published on the same occasion, saith, *that instead of peace, troubles arose by it; instead of unity and concord, greater divisions and disturbances: and by cutting off one head of the* Hydra, *seven more came up in its room*. Are not

Meyer. Annales Flandr. l. 10. *ad A D.* 1285.

Extravagant. communi. l. 5. *tit.* 7. *c.* 1.

the Popes great *Peace-makers*, the mean while? Therefore he reſolves, to try what the other way would do; and again inlarges the priviledges of the *Fryers*; which being found as unſucceſsful as ever *Clement* 5. reſumes the *Conſtitution* of *Boniface*, which this *Pope* condemned; and to as little purpoſe, as the other had done before. And now let us ſoberly conſider, whether there hath not alwayes been an *admirable Unity* in the *Roman Church*; or if diviſions have aroſe, a ready means to ſuppreſs them? Here we have the *Popes* interpoſing, by *Bull* after *Bull*; and ſo far from ending the differences that occaſioned them, that they begot more, which made the *Popes* contradict one another, nay the ſame *Pope* to contradict himſelf; and ſo the differences became greater, than they were at firſt. And after all theſe *Bulls*, we find the very ſame Controverſie at as great a height in *England*, and *Ireland*, as ever it had been in *France*, or *Germany*; *Wadding* ſaith, *it went ſo high, that the Biſhops and Clergy here would not ſuffer the Fryers to enjoy any of the priviledges, granted them by the Popes:* which cauſed an appeal to the *Pope*, made by the *Fryers*; to whom, in behalf of the Clergy, was ſent *Richard Fitz-Ralph*, the learned *Biſhop* of *Armagh*, beſt known by the name of *Armachanus*; who there, with great ſmartneſs, oppoſed the *Fryers* to the *Popes* face, in a long and ſet diſcourſe ſtill extant; wherein he gives an account, "that coming to *London*, about ſome buſineſs of "his *See*, he found great diſputes about the *pri-* "*viledges* of the *Fryers*; and being deſired to "Preach,

Wadding. Annal. Minorum ad A. D. 1357.

Rich. Armach. Defenſio Curat.

"Preach, he made seven or eight Sermons, "wherein he declared his mind against them, "both as to their Order, and Priviledges; in "which he followed the doctrine of the *Di-* "*vines* at *Paris*, above an hundred years before "delivered by them, upon the like occasion; "asserting it not to be in the Popes power, to "grant such priviledges which destroy the "rights of the *Parochial Clergy*, or the *juris-* "*diction* of the *Bishops*. The *Fryers* charge him with *Heresie*, *as they are wont to do those who are wiser than themselves*, saith *Boulay*: *Armachanus* dyed at *Avignon*, but so did not the Controversie with him; although the *Fryers* seem to have had the better there, they being the *Popes Janisaries*, and ready in all places to serve his turn: yet *Walsingham* saith, *it was not without corrupting the Popes Court, by great bribes given by the Fryers, that they obtained the confirmation of their priviledges*; yet seven years after, *Harpsfield* saith, *this Controversie was referred to the Parliament, to be determined.* Very strange! that a *Parliament* in *England* should be thought a more likely means for *Unity* in the *Church*, than the *Authority* of so many *Popes*, who had interposed in it, for putting an issue to this difference. After *Armachanus*, *Wickliffe* undertook this quarrel against the *Fryers*; and made use of the same arguments against them, which those who defended the *Clergy* had done before. For in his Book against the *Orders* of *Fryers*, he particularly insists upon this, *That they for pride and covetise had drawen fro Curats there Office and Sacraments, in which*

Bulæ. hist. univers. Paris. tom. 4. p. 337.

Walsingham hist. Angel. in Edv. 3. p. 173.

Joh. Wickliffe against the Orders of Fryers c. 10. p. 28.

lyen

lyen winning or worship; and so maken Dissention, betwixt Curats and there Ghostlie Childer. Which are his owe words. But *Wickliffe* and his Disciples carrying the Controversies much farther, to points of doctrine and other practices in the *Roman Church*, made the other parties more quiet, out of opposition to these whom they looked on as their common enemies. It may be therefore they will say, *that although the Popes Pastoral power may not alwayes cure their divisions, yet the opposition of Heretickes makes them run together like a flock of sheep*; if this were true, it seems they are more beholding to *Heretickes* for their *Unity*, than to the *Popes Authority*: but we shall find that neither one nor the other of these, nor both together, can keep them from divisions; and those managed with as great animosity, as we have ever found in the most differing Sects.

Of the differences between the regulars and secular's in *England*.

§. 9. Witness the proceedings between the *Jesuits* and the *Secular Priests*, begun in *Wisbich Castle*, in the latter end of *Q. Elizabeth Reign*; when it came to a separation from each other, about the authority of the *Arch-Priests*. And they mutually charged each other, with being guilty *of a horrible Schism*, maintained *with infinite violence, much infamy for the time, and innumerable particular wrongs thereupon, not unknown to the meanest Catholick in* England. The *secular Priests* finding themselves unjustly accused, as they said, to the *Pope*, published a Book in *Latin* which they Dedicated

Watsons Rep'y to *Parsons* his Libel. *p.* 2.

ed to his *Holineſs*, called *declaratio motuum & turbarum*; which, ſaith *Parſons* in his anſwer called, *A manifeſtation of the great folly and bad ſpirit of certain in* England *calling themſelves ſecular Prieſts*, "is made up only of in-"vectives, and paſſionate words, injurious, "and manifeſt falſe ſlanders; they in their Reply charge *Parſons* with *follie and madneſs*, and the *higheſt degree of impudencie*. If any one hath a mind to furniſh himſelf, with all the terms and phraſes of ſcolding, reproach and infamy, he may find them in the Books they then writ againſt each other; or if he thinks that too great a trouble, he may meet with a goodly parcel of them put together, out of *Fa. Parſons* his own writings, by *Watſon*, at the end of the *Reply to Parſons's Libel*. The ſhort account of the breach among them was this; all the loud talk they made abroad concerning their cruel perſecution, could not hinder ambition, and envy from having its effects among them; from theſe, firſt aroſe miſunderſtandings, and then quarrels, between the *ſecular Prieſts* and the *Jeſuits*: from thence, the Prieſts proceed to the framing a *ſodality*, (as they called it) among themſelves, the better to ſtrengthen themſelves againſt the *Jeſuits*; which they underſtanding prevail with one of the number of the *aſſociated Prieſts*, to betray their Councils; him they ſend to *Rome*, who in the name of all the *Prieſts* in *England* deſired, for the preventing differences for the future, and the curing thoſe that were already, that there might be a *Government* and *ſubordination* ſettled among

among them. *Fa. Parſons*, being then at *Rome*, follows the matter cloſe; and repreſents to the *Pope* the neceſſity of it, becauſe of the great diſcords which were among them in *England*. Whereupon the *Pope*, according to *Fa. Parſons* deſire, referrs the whole buſineſs to *Cardinal Cajetan*, their *Protector*. Who being governed by the *Jeſuits* pitched upon a perſon wholly at their devotion (as the *ſeculars* thought) which was *Blackwell*, a man ſwayed altogether by *Garnet*, Provincial of the *Jeſuits*; (well known for his zeal in the *Catholick cauſe*, by ſuffering as one of their *Martyrs* in the *Gunpowder Treaſon*) and one of the *Arch-Prieſts* inſtructions was, *in all matters of moment, to be adviſed by the Provincial of the Jeſuits*. The *ſecular Prieſts*, finding themſelves thus overreached by the cunning of the *Jeſuits*, and that they deſigned hereby wholly to govern their affairs, make many demurrs to his Authority; both concerning the manner, and the ſubſtance of it: and deſire a *Breve* from the *Pope*, and then promiſe to ſubmit. *Parſons* procures one to their purpoſe, and an appearance of peace was for a little time among them; and they mutually promiſed not to charge the *Schiſm* upon each other; but within a month or ſix weeks, the flame brake out with greater fury than ever, the *Arch-Prieſt* ſending his directions into all parts, *that none of the Seculars ſhould be admitted to the Sacraments without acknowledging themſelves Schiſmaticks*. So that the *Popes Breve* was ſo far from ending the difference, that it encreaſed it; *Fa. Parſons* charging them,

them, (and the *Seculars* not denying it) that after it, they were farther from obeying the *Arch-Priest*, than they were before. So unhappy have the *Popes* been, when they have gone about to use their *Authority* for composing differences, among those who are in their own *Church?*

But we leave this, and come to a later controversie among them, about the same matters of Order and Government. *Richard Smith*, titular *Bishop* of *Chalcedon*, was invested with the Authority of *Ordinary*, over their *English Clergy* by *Urban* 8. *Febr.* 4. *A. D.* 1625. not long after, he comes into *England*; and was received with so great kindness by their party here, as made the *Jesuits* (who are friends to none, but themselves) soon to become his enemies; especially when he began to exercise his *Episcopal jurisdiction* here, in laying *restraints* upon the *Regulars*; which the *Jesuits* with other *Regulars* grew so impatient of, that they soon revived the old quarrel, concerning the *authority* and *jurisdiction* of *Bishops*; and managed it with so great heat and fierceness, that the titular *Bishop* was fain to leave the field, and withdraw into *France*. The bottom of the quarrel was, they found the kindness of their party to them abated, since the *Bishops* coming; who before had sway'd all, and lived in great plenty and bravery; when *the poor Seculars got scarce bread to eate*, as *Watson* very sadly laments, in his answer to *Parsons*; but now the necessary support of the dignity of a *Bishop*, made the charity of their

their party run in another channel; which the *Provincial* of the *Jesuits* complains of, in a Letter to the *Bishop* of *Chalcedon*. Therefore they endeavour all they can to make a party against him, among the people too; which they did so effectually, as amounted to his *withdrawing*, a more civil word for his exile. And now, both parties being sufficiently heated, the battel begins, in which not only *England* and *Ireland*, but *France* and *Flanders*, were deeply engaged. The first who appeared was Dr. *Kellison*, Professour of *Doway*, in a Book in *Vindication of the Bishops Authority*; to whom *Knot*, then *Vice-Provincial* of the *Jesuits*, returned his *Modest and brief discussion*, &c. under the name of *Nicholas Smith*, a *Jesuite* then dead. Soon after came out another, written to the same purpose, under the name of *Daniel* of *Jesu*, whose true name was *John Fluide* (which the other, writing *Josnes* for *John*, was the *Anagram* of,) he was a *Jesuit* too, and *Professour* at St. *Omars*: which Books, were first censured by the *Arch-bishop* of *Paris*, then by the *Sorbonne*, and at last by the *Bishops* of *France*, in an *Assembly* of them at *Paris*: but the *Jesuits* were so far from giving over by this, that they set forth their Books again in *Latin*, with large approbations of them; and publish a *Remonstrance* against the *Bishop* of *Chalcedon*, in the name of the *Catholick party in England*; which was disowned by the greatest number of them, and cast wholly upon the *Jesuits*: the same year, 1631. three Books were published by the *Secular Clergy* here, in opposition

to

to the *Jesuits*. Who were so far from quitting the Field by reason of the number of their enemies, that they begin a fresh charge against both the *Sorbonne Doctors* and the *French Clergy*, under the fained name of *Hermannus Loemelius*, whose chief Author was the fore-named *Jesuite Lloyd* with the assistance of his Brethren, as the diversity of the style shews: and another Book came out against the *Faculty* of *Paris*, in *Vindication* of *Knot* or *Nicholas Smith*, with many approbations of *Bishops*, *Universities*, and *private Doctors*: and in Vindication of the *Propositions* of *Ireland* (likewise censured at *Paris*) another Book came forth, under the name of *Edmundus Ursulanus*, whose true name was *Mac-mahone*, *Prior* of the *Franciscan Convent* in *Lovain*. About the same time, the *Jesuits* published their *Censure* of the *Apostolical Creed*, in imitation of the *censures* at *Paris*, against their Doctrine (as though their *Doctrines* were as certain as that, and themselves as *infallible* as the *Apostles*:) wherein they charge the *Bishops* their enemies, with reviving old Heresies, and broaching new ones. The *Jesuits* having now done such great things, triumph unreasonably in all places, as having utterly overthrown their enemies, and beaten them out of the field: when, in a little time after, *Hallier* and *le Maistre*, two Doctors of the *Sorbonne*, undertake the quarrel against them; but none was so highly magnified and infinitely applauded by the *French Clergy*, as a person under the disguised name of *Petrus Aurelius*; whose atchievements in this kind they celebrate, next

to

to those of the *Pucelle d'Orleans*; and Printed all his Works together, at their own charge: and writ a high *Elogium* of him, which is prefixed before them. And the *secular Clergy* of *England* sent him a letter of Congratulation for his Triumphs, subscribed by *John Colleton Dean* of the *Chapter*, and *Edmond Dutton Secretary*; wherein, they sadly lament the discords that have been among them here, and the *Heresies* broached by their Adversaries, by occation of them. The main of this Controversie did concern the *dignity*, *necessity*, and *jurisdiction* of the *Episcopal Order*; as appears by the Censures of the *Bishops* of *France*, and by *Aurelius*, who saith, "that although the Dis-
"pute began upon occasion of the *Bishop* of *Chal-*
"*cedon*, and the English Clergy, yet it was now
"carried farther, whether the *Episcopal* Order
"was necessary to the *Being* of a particular
"*Church*? Whether it was by *divine right*, or
"no? Whether confirmation might be given,
"without *Bishops*? Whether the *Episcopal Or-*
"*der* was more perfect, than the *Monastical*?
"Whether the *Regulars* were under the juris-
"diction of *Bishops*? And therefore the *Jesuits* are charged by their *Adversaries*, with a design to extirpate and ruine the whole *Order* of *Episcopacy*. Have not these men now great reason to insult over us, that some of these questions have caused great differences among us; when the *Jesuits* in *England* had laid the foundation of them, by their *quarrels* of the same kind, but a little before; and furnished the enemies to *Episcopacy* and the *Church* of *England*,

Petri Aurelii opera tom. 1. p. 62.

England, with so many arguments to their hands, to manage their bad cause with? But what becomes of the *Court* of *Rome*, all this while? do the *Pope* and *Cardinals* only stand still, to see what the issue of the Battel will be, without ever offering to compose the difference, between the two parties? No. The *Jesuits*, finding how hard they were put to it, make their *address* to *Rome*, as their greatest *Sanctuary*, and *A. D.* 1633. obtained a *Decree* of the *Sacred Congregation*, for suppressing the Books on both sides; without judging any thing at all of the merits of the cause, or giving any *censure* of the *authority* on either side? And is not now the *Popes* authority an excellent remedy, for all *divisions* in the *Church*? When in so great a heat as this was, the *Pope* durst not interpose at all in the main business, for fear of losing either side; which is a plain argument, that they themselves look on his Authority as so precarious a thing, that they must by no means expose it, where it is like to be called in *Question*. Were not her *Controversies* fit to be determined? To what purpose is that authority, that dare not be exercised when there is most need of it? and when could there be greater need, than in such a time, when the *Church* was in a flame by these contentions? And yet so timerous a *Decree* as this was, could find no acceptance. For at *Paris* immediately comes out a *disquisition* upon it, "shewing the "unreasonableness of it, in suppressing Books "without enquiring into the merits of the "cause, in a matter of so great consequence as

"that was; that this would give great occaſion "of triumph to the Hereticks, when ſuch "ſcandalous and ſeditious Books, as thoſe of "the Jeſuits are, meet with the ſame favour at "*Rome*, with the cenſure of the *Biſhops* of "*France*: that their *profane* and *Atheiſtical Cen-* "*ſure* of the *Apoſtles Creed* muſt have no mark "of diſgrace put upon it; nor ſuch ſayings "of theirs, wherein they call the Biſhops "and *Divines* of *France* by moſt contumelious "names, and ſay they are the enemies of the "truth and piety. The *Jeſuits*, inſtead of de-fending themſelves againſt *Aurelius*, write a pitiful defence of this Decree, of ſuppreſſing the Books on both ſides, and ſo all the means, which the *Court* of *Rome* durſt uſe to extin-guiſh this flame, proved but an occaſion of add-ing to it. And whether this Controverſie be yet at an end among them, let all the heats in *France* and *England* of late years concerning the *Jeſuits* give teſtimony.

Of the Jeſuits particular oppoſition to Biſhops and their Authority.

§. 10. I ſhall not now inſiſt any longer upon them, but only produce ſome late paſſages of things (which though they happened at a greater diſtance, are yet ſufficiently atteſted) to ſhew what ſpight the *Jeſuital Order* bears, to the *Authority* of *Biſhops*; what arts they have uſed to enervate it, what power to affront their perſons, and expoſe them to all the contempt that may be, when they go about to ſtop their proceedings, or exerciſe any juriſdiction over them. The great occaſion of the Controverſie between the *Biſhops* and them was, that the *Jeſuits* took upon them

to

to Preach, and hear Confessions, &c. without any permission from the *Bishop* of the *Diocese*. So they did in the *Philippine Islands*, whereupon the *Archbishop* of *Manille*, *Don Aernando Guerrero* called a Synod; wherein it was resolved, that the Archbishop ought to bring the *Jesuits* to account for what they did; which he did, and all the satisfaction he could get from them was, *that they had priviledges*; the *Archbishop*, not satisfied with this, proceeds against them; they name a *Conservator* an enemy of the *Archbishops*, (For the *Popes* to keep the *Bishops* in awe, have allowed them, by a *Bull* for that purpose, liberty, in case of difference between the *Bishops* and them, to choose a *Conservator*, to defend their priviledges against them) this *Conservator* proceeds against the *Archbishop*, and the *Jesuits* procure the Governor to joyn with him; who, without giving leave to him to make his Defence, resolve to banish him. The *Archbishop*, understanding their resolution to send him away, goes with the *Clergie* about him into his *Chappel*; and there, to secure himself from the insolence of the *Souldiers*, in his *Pontifical habit*, holds the *Eucharist* in his hand: notwithstanding which, they came and dragged out all the *Fryers*, who took the *Archbishops* part; and afterwards, the old *Archbishop* himself, who fell down in the crowd with the *Pix* in his hand, and wounded himself in the face. Such exorbitances made that impression on one of the Souldiers, that he drew his sword, and falling upon it said, *He had rather dye by his own hands, than see such enormities*

Moral practice of the Jesuits. *p.* 328.

Bull. Rom. Tom 2. *p.* 361. *Bull.* 1. *Greg.* 15.

among Chriſtians. At laſt, the Arch-biſhop was forced to let go his *Pix*, and was preſently carryed away out of the City; and put into a little pittiful Barque, unprovided of all things, without permitting any food to be given him, or any of his ſervants to accompany him; and was conveyed by five Souldiers into a Deſart *Iſland*, where he had not ſo much as a *Cabin* for ſhelter; and there he was kept, till he yielded to their terms. O the admirable unity, peace, and ſubmiſſion to *Biſhops* in the *Roman Church!* But we have yet a more remarkable inſtance of this kind, in the notorious caſe of the difference between the *Biſhop* of *Angelopolis* in *America*, and the *Jeſuits*; which was heard at *Rome*, and ſeveral *Bulls* publiſhed by *Innocent* 10. in it. I ſhall give an account of it, from the *Popes Bulls*, and from the letter which the *Biſhop* himſelf ſent to the *Pope* about it, *A. D.* 1649. which is extant in the *Collection* at the end of *Mr. S. Amours Journal*; which he had from *Coſimo Ricciardi* Sub-library-keeper of the *Vatican*, who received it immediately from the *Biſhops Agent*. The controverſie began there upon the very ſame grounds, which it had done in the *Philippine Iſlands*; for the *Jeſuits* would acknowledge no ſubjection at all to the *Biſhop*, but would Preach and hear Confeſſions, without any licenſe from the *Biſhop*; which difference grew ſo high, that the *Jeſuits* choſe *Conſervators*, againſt the *Biſhops* authority; as the *Popes Bull* granted, *May* 14. *A. D.* 1648. doth declare; and not only ſo, but theſe *Conſervators* very fairly ex-

Collection of *Tract.* *p.* 11.

excommunicated the *Bishop* and his *Vicar General*: upon this, the *Bishop* sends an *Agent* to *Rome*, and the *Jesuits* appear in behalf of their *Society*; the *Pope* commits the cause, to a particular Congregation of *Cardinals* and *Bishops*; who, upon the hearing of both sides, give sentence in favour of the *Bishop*, *Apr.*16. *A.D.* 1648. But the *Jesuits* (as appears by the *Bishops* letter, bearing date, *Jan.*8. *A.D.*1649.) were resolved not to wait, for the *Popes* resolution; but finding that the people contemned their censures, and adhered to the *Bishop*, were so enraged at it, that they resolved to imprison him: to that end, they bribe the *King* of *Spains Vice-roy*, the *Bishops* particular enemy, with a great summ of money; and by that means clapt up most of his Friends, and threatned them with worse, if they would not obey the *Conservators*, the *Bishop* himself they had appointed Souldiers to seize upon, on *Corpus Christi* day, (the better day, the better deed) who understanding their minds, sent commissioners to treat with them, to prevent the *tumults* and *disorders* were like to follow on these differences; but they used them with contempt, and would hear of no terms, unless the *Bishop* would submit himself, and his jurisdiction, to them and their *Conservators*; but instead of peace they proceed to more open acts of hostility, by imprisoning his *Vicar General*, and using all manner of insolencies among the *People*, who joyned with the *Bishop* to defend him against them. The good *Bishop*, seeing things in so bad a posture, thought it his greatest pru-

dence to withdraw to the mountains, thinking himself safer, among the *Serpents* and *Scorpions* there, than in the City among the *Jesuits*. There he continues for twenty days, almost famished; and afterwards, for four months lay hid in a pitiful Cottage; the *Jesuits*, in the mean time, offering great sums of money to those, who should bring him alive or dead. But not finding him, they bring the excommunicated *Conservators* with great pomp into the *City*; and erect a *Tribunal*, or in the language of the late times, a *High Court of Justice* among them; where according to their pleasure they fine, banish, imprison as many as they thought their enemies; and there solemnly declare, what mighty injury the *Bishop* had done the *Jesuits*, in forbidding them to Preach without *licenses* from him, or till such time as they produced those, which they had from his Predecessors: then they declare the *Bishops See* to be vacant; and caused it to be published in the *Churches*, that the *Jesuits* did not need any license from the *Bishop*; they *null* all censures against them, recall all Orders published by the *Bishop*, for the good *Government* of his *Diocese*. The *Bishop* in the mean time privately sends monitory *letters* to the people, to bear the present persecution with patience, but by no means to associate with, or to hear those excommunicated persons, who had offered such affronts to his authority and jurisdiction; by which means, the people not being prevailed upon, they with a great sum of money procure some Secular *Judges*, to form a judicial Process

Proceſs againſt the *Biſhop* for *Sedition*; to which end, they ſuborn witneſſes againſt him, but could make evidence of nothing tending to ſedition, but forbidding the *Jeſuits* to Preach. This not taking, they attempt another way, to expoſe him to contempt; upon the Sacred day of their holy *Father Ignatius*, they put their Scholars in *Maſcarade*, and ſo perſonating the *Biſhop* and his *Clergy*, they make a proceſſion through the *Town*, in the *middle* of the *day*, and ſung the *Pater noſter* and *Ave Maria* as they went, with horrible blaſphemies perverting both of them to the abuſe of the *Biſhop* and his *party*; inſtead of ſaying *libera nos à malo*, they ſaid *libera nos à Palafox*, which was the name of the *Biſhop*: and others had the *Epiſcopal ſtaffe* hanging at a Horſe taile, and the *Miter* on their ſtirrups, to let them ſee how much they had it under their *feet*: others ſung *Lampoons* againſt the *Biſhop*, others did ſuch things which are not fit to be repeated: Which were parts of this glorious triumph of the *Jeſuits* over the *Biſhop* and his *Authority*. But in the midſt of this exceſſive jollity, the *King* of *Spains Navy* arrived, wherein the *Kings* commands were brought for removing the *Vice-Roy*, who was the great Friend of the *Jeſuits*; the news of this, abated their heat, and the *Biſhop* ſecretly conveys himſelf into his *Palace*, which the people hearing of, ran with incredible numbers to embrace him, for ſeveral dayes together; upon which the *Jeſuits* complain to the old *Vice-Roy* of a ſedition, and obtained from him a command to the *Chapter*, not to

yield to the *Biſhops* Juriſdiction; which cauſed a great diviſion among them, one part adhering to the *Biſhop*, and another to the *Jeſuits*; the *Biſhop* therefore, ſeeing the differences to riſe higher, and the *Schiſm* to be greater, and the miſerable condition the *Church* was in among them, was fain to ſubmit, and promiſe to innovate nothing, but to wait the *Popes* deciſion. Not long after, another ſhip arrived from *Spain*, with an *Expreſs* from the *King*, wherein the *Vice-Roy* was commanded immediately to ſurrender his *Government*; and was ſeverely rebuked, for aſſiſting the *Jeſuits* againſt the *Biſhop*; and all the acts in that matter were nulled by the *Kings* authority; but the *Jeſuits*, according to their uſual integrity, gave out juſt the contrary to the Orders received, and framed Letters on purpoſe, which they diſperſed among the people. But theſe arts never holding long, when the *Vice-Roy*'s Succeſſor was eſtabliſhed, the truth brake forth; and the *Biſhop* returned to the exerciſe of his former *Authority*.

But notwithſtanding the *Kings* Declaration, and the *Popes Breve* was now publiſhed among them, the *Jeſuits* perſiſted ſtill in their obſtinate diſobedience, and, although excommunicated by the *Biſhop*, yet continued to Preach and act as before. And hereby we have a plain diſcovery, what a mighty regard the *Jeſuits* have to the *Papal See*, if it once oppoſe their *deſigns*; and what an effectual inſtrument of *Peace* and *Unity* the *Popes* Authority is; for they preſently found ways enough, to decline,

decline the force of the *Popes Bull.* For, (1.) They said, it could have no force there, because it was not received by the *Council* of the *Indies*, it seems, *pasce oves*, and *dabo tibi claves*, &c. signifie nothing in the *Indies*, unless the *Kings Council* pleases, or rather, unless the *Jesuits* please to let it do so. (2.) They pleaded bravely for themselves, that the *priviledges* granted them by the *Popes* were in consideration of their merits, and so were of the nature of *contracts* and *Covenants*; and therefore could not be revoked by the *Pope*. (3.) That the *Popes constitutions* in this matter were not received by the *Church*, and *Laws* which are not received are no *Laws*: But as the Bishop well urges against them, if these wayes of interpreting the *Popes Bulls* be allowed, his *Authority* will signifie nothing, and all his *Constitutions* shall have no more force, than those against whom they are directed be pleased to yield to them; and it will be impossible to preserve peace in the *Church*, if it shall be in the power of offenders to declare, whether the *Laws* against them are to be received for *Laws* or no. *But this*, saith he, *is the inspiration and illumination of the Jesuits, and their method of interpreting the Papal constitutions*; which he heard very often from their own mouths, in the frequent conferences he had with them, about these matters; But they had another way, to decline the *Kings Authority*; for the *King* and his *Council* being all *Lay-men*, they had nothing to do in *Ecclesiastial matters*. By which means (as the *Bishop* saith,) they make themselves superiour both

both to *King* and *Pope*, and free from all jurisdiction, either *spiritual* or *temporal*. And I dare appeal to the most indifferent person, whether any Doctrine broached by the greatest *Fanaticks* among us, ever tended more to the dissolution of *Government*, the countenancing sedition, the perpetuating *Schisms* in the *Church*, than these of the *Jesuits* do? And therefore the *Bishop* saith, *that he had rather lay down his life, than by yielding up his jurisdiction expose his authority to Contempt, and the Church to the continual danger of Schisms*; and by many weighty arguments perswades the *Pope*, if he truly designed the peace and flourishing of the *Church*, speedily and effectually to reform the whole *Order* of the *Jesuits*; *without which*, he saith, *it is impossible, especially in those remoter parts, for the Bishops to preserve any Authority*. And, besides other corruptions among them, he tells strange stories, of their wayes of propagating *Christian Religion* in *China*, and other neighbour Nations; which they boast so much of at this distance; but, he saith, they who are so much nearer and understand those things better, have cause to lament the infinite scandals which they give to the *Christian Religion*, in doing it. The account which he gives of these things, this *Bishop* protests he sends to the *Pope*, only to clear his own Conscience; that he might not be condemned at the day of judgement, for concealing that which he so certainly knew to be true, from those who were eye-witnesses of it. Their first work is, to hinder all persons,

of

any other *Order* whatsoever, from coming among them; and if they do come, by one means or other, they are sure to procure their banishment and persecution; to this end, they assist and counsel the *Infidels* themselves in it, and make use of their hands to whip and imprison them, and so to make them weary of being there. When they are left alone, they have the liberty of telling their own *stories*, and no one can disprove them; but they were not so watchful, but some of the other *Orders* were sent as *Spyes* upon them; and although they knew, they hazarded their lives in it, yet they made full discovery of the *Jesuits* way of converting *Infidels*. And they discovered such horrible things, in the *Catechisms* they gave to their new *Converts*, that they complained to the *Pope* of them; but, as appears by the event, to very little purpose; for although, the *Jesuits* could not deny the things they were charged with, and the *Congregation, de propagandâ fide*, at *Rome*, Sept. 12. A. D. 1645. in *seventeen Decrees* condemned them; yet the *Rector* of the *Jesuits Colledge* in the *Philippines*, in a Book of 300 pages, opposed those Decrees, which was in the hands of the *Bishop* of *Angelopolis*, and he gave it to a *Dominican* to answer, who had been in those parts himself, who fully proved the matter of fact, and answered the *Jesuits* arguments, both which the *Bishop* saith, were in his custody. The short of their instructions to their *Converts* was this, to speak little of *Christ Crucified*, but to conceal that small and inconsiderable circumstance

ſtance of the *Chriſtian Doctrine*, as much may be; to uſe all the ſame cuſtomes that the *Idolators* did, only directing all their worſhip to Chriſt and the Saints; not to trouble themſelves about Faſting, Penance, Confeſſion, and participation of the Euchariſt, or the ſeverity of Repentance and Mortification. They deſigned to recommend as eaſie a *Religion* to them as may be, the better to invite them to embrace it; and therefore, as the *Biſhop* obſerves, we read of no *Martyrs* among them: the poor *Dominicans* and *Franciſcans* are whipt, and impriſoned, and baniſhed; but the *Jeſuits*, who Preach only a glorious *Chriſt*, without his *paſſion* and *croſſe*, have far better and eaſier entertainment among them. But theſe things the *Biſhop* there gives a larger account of: I return to the Controverſie between the *Biſhop* and *them*: An *Agent* was ſent to *Rome* by the *Biſhop* with this letter, to negotiate his buſineſs there againſt the *Jeſuits*; *a man intelligent, vigorous* and *undaunted*, ſaith *Mr. S. Amour* of him; who followed his buſineſs ſo cloſe, that after long ſolicitation and addreſs, he obtains another *Decree* againſt the *Jeſuits*, which is extant at large in the *Lyons* Edition of the *Bullarium*: but which ought to be obſerved, is ſince prohibited by the *Index Expurgatorius* of *Alexander* 7. by whoſe means that was procured, is eaſie to conjecture; when we conſider, with what difficulty the *Decree* was obtained; and for above a *year* after the paſſing it, the coming of it forth was hindred by *Cardinal Spada* under-hand, who was a great Friend to the *Jeſuits*. And when

S. Amours Journal. p. 5. ch. 15.

Index. Alex. A.D. 1658.

when it did come forth, the *Jesuits* bought up all the *Copies* of it they could, on purpose to abolish the memory of it: which made them obtain the prohibition of the *Bullarium*, till that part were purged out of it. But if the *Popes* had any real kindness for the *Authority* of *Bishops*, they would never suffer such encroachments to be made upon them, as they do; nor shew so much favour, to the contemners of it. But this is one of the grand *Intrigues* of the *Roman Court*, to keep the *Bishops* down by the *priviledges* of the *Regulars*, who are immediate *dependents* on the *Popes*; only at some times, when they cannot help it, they must seem to curb them; but yet so, as to keep them in heart enough to *bait* the *Bishops*, when they begin to exercise their *Authority*, as they ought to do, in the reformation of abuses and disorders. But by these heats and controversies among them, about matters of *Government* and *Order*, it appears, that they have no cause to upbraid us, with our *dissensions* about them: And that they have no more effectual means to suppress them, than *We*.

S. Amours Journal. p. 7. ch. 5.

§. 11. 2. As to *matters* of *doctrine*. The least thing any one could imagine, by all the boasts of *Unity* among them, and their upbraiding others with their *dissensions*, is, that they are all of one mind, in *matters of doctrine*; but he must believe against common sense and experience, that can believe this. For we know their *divisions* well enough, and that it is as easie a matter to compose all the differences among us, as among them. We may assoon

Of their differences in matters of doctrine.

aſſoon perſwade the *Quakers* to *Uniformity*, as reconcile the *Dominicans* and the *Jeſuits*; and all our *Sects* will agree aſſoon, as the *factions* of the *Thomiſts* and *Scotiſts*; the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* will yield to *Epiſcopal juriſdiction*, aſſoon as the *Monaſtick Orders* will quit their *priviledges*; the *Arminians* and *Calviniſts* will be all of a mind, when the *Janſeniſts* and *Moliniſts* are: and we are apt to think, that our Controverſies about *Ceremonies* are not altogether of ſo great importance, as theirs about *infallibity*. But it is a very pleaſant thing to ſee, by what arts they go about to perſwade credulous people, that what would be called *diviſions* any where elſe, is an *admirable Union* among them; they might aſſoon perſwade them, that the ſeven Hills of *Rome* are the *bottomleſs pit*, or that contradictions may be true. For either the *Pope* is infallible, or he is not; either the ſupream *Government* of the *Church*, is committed to him alone as St. *Peters* Succeſſour, or to the repreſentative Church in a *Council*; either he hath a temporal power to command *Princes*, or he hath not; either the *V. Mary* was conceived with *Original ſin*, or ſhe was not; either there is a *Pre-determination*, or there is not; either *Souls* may be delivered out of *Purgatory*, or they may not: Dare any of them ſay, they are all of a mind in the *Church* of *Rome* about theſe points? I am ſure they dare not. But what then? do they not differ from one another? do they not write, and Preach, and rail againſt each other, as much

as

as any Sectaries can do? are there not factions of long continuance among them, upon these differences? where then lyes their *Unity* they boast off? Alas! we speak like Ignorant persons, and do not consider, what artificial men we have to deal with; who, with some pretty tricks and slights of hand, make all that which seems to us shattered and broken in pieces, to appear sound and entire, without the least crack or flaw in it. It will be worth the while, to find out these arts; for I do not question, but by a discreet managing them, they may serve us as well as them; and our Church will have, (though not so much splendour) yet as much *Unity* as theirs. They tell us therefore, that it is true they are not all of a mind, *and it is not necessary to the* Unity *of the Church that they should be:* but, they have *the only way of composing differences*; and they do not differ *in matters of faith from each other*; and *their differences lye only in their Schools, and do not disturb the peace of the Church.* This is the utmost I can find their best wits plead, for the *Unity* of the *Roman Church*; and if these be sufficient, I believe they and we will be proved to be as much at Unity, as they are among themselves.

1. They say, *the Unity of the Church doth not lye in actual Agreement of the members of it, in matters of Doctrine; but in having the best means to compose differences, and to preserve consent; which is, submission to the Popes Authority.* So *Gregory de Valentia* explains the *Unity* of their *Church*; *for actual consent*, he grants, *may* *Greg. de Valent. Analys. fidei l. 6. c. 49.*

may be in other Churches, as much as theirs; and there is nothing ſingular or peculiar attributed to their Church, ſuppoſing they were all of a mind, which it is plain they are not; but therein, ſaith he, *lyes the Unity of their Church, that they all acknowledge one Head, in whoſe judgement they acquieſce: and therefore, they have no more to do, but to know what the Pope determines.* If this be all their Unity, we have greater than they; for we have a more certain way of ending Controverſies, than they have: which I prove by an argument, like to one in great requeſt among them, when they go about to perſwade weak perſons to their *Religion*, viz. *that it muſt needs be ſafer to be in that Religion, wherein both parties agree a man may be ſaved; than in that, where one ſide denies a poſſibility of ſalvation*; ſo ſay I here, that muſt be a ſafer way for Unity, which both parties agree to be infallible, than that which one ſide abſolutely denyes to be ſo; but both parties agree the *Scriptures* to be infallible, and all *Proteſtants* deny the *Pope* to be infallible; therefore ours is the more certain way for *Unity*. But this is not all; for it is far from being agreed among themſelves, that the *Pope* is *infallible*; it being utterly denyed by ſome among them, and the aſſerting it accounted *Hereſie*: as is evident in ſome late Books written to that purpoſe, in *France* and *England*: What excellent means of *Unity* then is this among them; which it is accounted by ſome no leſs than *Hereſie* to aſſert?

§. 13.

§. 13. But ſuppoſing they ſhould yield the *Pope* that ſubmiſſion, which they deny to be due to him; yet how is his definition ſo much a more certain way of ending Controverſies than the *Scriptures*? Let them name one Controverſie that hath been ended in their *Church*, meerly by the *Popes Decrees*; ſo as the oppoſite party hath declared, that they believed contrary to what they believed before, on the account of the *Popes* definition. We have many inſtances to the contrary, wherein controverſies have been heightened and increaſed by their interpoſing, but none concluded by them. Do they ſay the *Scripture* can be no means of *Unity*, becauſe of the various *ſenſes* which have been put upon it? and have they no wayes, to evade the *Popes* definitions? Yes, ſo many, that his *Authority* in truth ſignifies nothing, any farther than they agree that the upholding it tends to their common intereſt. But when once he comes to croſs the intereſt of any party, if they do not in plain terms defie him, yet they find out more civil wayes, of making his *Definitions* of no force. Either they ſay, the *Decree* was procured by *fraud*, and the *Pope* made it by miſ-information, which is the common way; or he did not define it as a *matter of faith*, ſitting *in Cathedrâ*; or the *ſenſe* of his definition is quite otherwiſe, than their *Adverſaries* underſtand it; or ſuppoſing that be the ſenſe, the *Pope* is never to be ſuppoſed to define any thing contrary to the *Scriptures* and *Fathers* and *ancient Canons*: Of all which it were no difficult task, to give late and particular inſtances; The inſufficiency of the *Pops* Authority for ending theſe differences.

but no one, who is acquainted with the hiſtory of that *Church*, can be ignorant of them; and the late proceedings, in the matter of the *five Propoſitions*, are a ſufficient evidence of theſe things, to any one who reads them. For when was there a Fairer occaſion given to the *Pope*, to ſhew his *Authority* for preſervation of the *Churches* unity, than at that time, when the matter of the *five Propoſitions* was under debate at *Rome*: The ſame controverſie was now revived, which had diſturbed their *Church* ſo often, and ſo much, before. In the time of *Clement* 8 the heats were ſo great between the *Jeſuits* and *Dominicans*, that the *Pope* thought it neceſſary, for the peace of the *Church*, to put an end to them; to that end he appointed Congregations, for ſeveral years to diſcuſs thoſe points, that he might come to a reſolution in them. This *Pope* at firſt was ſtrangely prepoſſeſt, by the arts of the *Jeſuits*, againſt the *Dominicans*; but ſending for the *General* of the *Dominicans*, he told him what ſad apprehenſions he had concerning the peace of the *Church*, by reaſon of the diſputes between the *Jeſuits* and them; and therefore charges him, that thoſe of his *Order* ſhould no longer moleſt the *Jeſuits*, about theſe things; to whom he replyed, *that he aſſured him with as great Proteſtation as he was able, that it was no meer Scholaſtical diſpute between them, but it was the cauſe of faith that was concerned*, which he diſcourſed largely upon to the *Pope*, and made ſuch impreſſions upon him, that the *Dominicans* verily believe, that had that *Pope* lived to the *Veſpers*, of *Pentecoſt* that year he

S. Amour's Journal p. 3. ch. 10 Journal p. 6. ch. 6. --- P. 3. ch. 8

he dyed in *March*, he had published a *Bull* against the *Jesuits*, in presence of the *College* of *Cardinals*, and created *F. Lemos Cardinal*. After his death, the congregations were continued in the time of *Paul* 5. but at last were broken up, without any decision at all. If the *Popes* determination be such an absolute *Instrument of peace* in the *Church*, it is the strangest thing in the world, it should be made so little use of, in such cases where they all acknowledge, it would be of infinite advantage to their *Church*, to have an issue put to such troublesome controversies as these were. But they know well enough, that the *Popes Authority* is the more esteemed, the less it is used; and that it hath alwayes been very hazardous to determine, where there have been considerable parties, on both sides; for fear the condemned party should renounce his *Authority*, or speak plainer truths than they are willing to hear. And therefore it was well observed by *Mons. S. Amour*, that *they are very jealous at* Rome, *of maintaining the Authority of the decrees which issue from thence; and that this consideration obliges the maker of them, to look very well to the compliance and facility that may be expected in their execution, before they pass any at all.* Which is a most certain argument they dare not trust the *Popes infalibility*, nor all the promises they pretend *Christ* hath made to their *Church*; but govern their affairs wholly, by the rules of *humane Policy*. And on this account, when the heats brake forth in *France*, about *Jansenism*; and both parties made application to the *Court* of *Rome*, the *Pope* could

Journal p. 1. b. 9.

could never be prevailed with, to ſuffer the main controverſies to be touched, or any decree to paſs about them; but at laſt condemned ſome ambiguous *Propoſitions*, as taken out of *Janſenius* his book; which both parties condemned according to their different ſenſes, and they were left to diſpute it out, which ſenſe it was the *Pope* meant them in. And therefore the *Janſeniſts Advocate*, who was well verſed in the practices of the *Court* of *Rome*, gave them the trueſt account of the intentions of that *Court*, in their affair; which was, *to delude both the one ſide and the other*; and that *Cardinal Ginetti* had told him, that *either nothing would be done; or if any thing, that which would do neither good nor hurt.* And therefore, inſtead of ending the controverſies, the *Popes* definition only produced more, *viz.* whether the *Propoſitions* condemned were in *Janſenius* or no? whether the *Pope* might not erre in matter of fact? the *Janſeniſts* affirming this, the *Jeſuits* denying it; and charging each other, with no leſs than *Hereſie* about it. For upon the *Jeſuits* aſſerting *Octob.* 12. *A. D.* 1661. *that the Pope hath the ſame infallibility that Jeſus Chriſt hath, not only in Queſtions of right but in matters of fact; and that thence thoſe of their Church are bound to believe with a divine faith, that the* 5. *condemned Propoſitions are in Janſenius:* the "*Janſeniſts* publiſh a charge of hereſie againſt "the *Jeſuits*, and ſuch a hereſie as was never "broached in the *Church* before: being not only "a ſolitary error or ſimple *hereſie*, but a whole "ſource of errours; or rather an *univerſal hereſie*, "which

Journal p. 6. *ch.* 3.

Part 6. *ch.* 13.

"which overthrows all *Religion*. Which they "go about at large to prove, by shewing, that "this builds mens faith, on the *word of man*, "and not on *the word of God*, because it con- "cerns a thing, neither revealed nor attested by "*God*; as to know, whether *Propositions* are "really an *Authors* of this last Age, and (as "he goes on) to make the *Popes* word equal "with the *word of God*, is not only *heresie*, but "horrid *impiety*, and a *species* of *Idolatry*: for "this is giving to man the honour due only to "*God*: because such an entire submission of our "mind and of all our intellectuals, comprehend- "ed in the act of our faith, is that Adoration "which we pay to the prime *verity* it self. And I dare now leave any one to Judge, whe- ther upon so late an experiment of the *Con- stitutions* of two *Popes Innocent* 10. and *Alexan- der* 7. in order to the ending so great a Contro- versie as this was, it be not apparent, that the *Popes Authority* signifies no more to the ending Controversies, than the parties who are concern- ed are willing that it should *i. e.* as far as they do consent to obey them, and no farther?

The insuffi- ciency of Councils to end Controver- sies.

§. 14. But it may be said, *that it is true, there are differences among them about the Popes power and infallibility, and therefore he may not be so fit to end Controversies; but there is no dis- pute among them, about Pope and Council to- gether, therefore in that case they are all agreed, that they ought to submit.* These are fine things to be said, and appear plausibly, to those who do not search into them; but those that do, will easily find this as ineffectual a

remedy, as the other. For if we examine but the wayes uſed by the ſeveral parties among them, to avoid the deciſions of ſome *Councils* againſt their particular opinions, we may ſee, how little the decrees of *Councils* can bind thoſe, who have no mind to be tyed up by them. Either they ſay, the deciſion depended on a *matter of fact*, which the *Council* was not ſufficiently informed in, and they believe a *Council* may erre in a matter of fact; or elſe it did not proceed *after the way of a Council*; or it was not general; or its *decrees* were not received by the *Catholick Church*; or though ſome were received, yet not all; or however, the infallibility of a *Council* is not abſolute; but ſuppoſing, that it proceeds according to the conſtant *tradition* of the *Church*, this unavoidably leaves the matter as much under debate, as if the *Council* had never meddled with it.

But if they do in earneſt believe, that the *Pope* and *Council* can put an end to all Controverſies among them, when they pleaſe; I would fain know, why they have not done this hitherto? Is not *unity* deſirable among them? if not, why do they boaſt of it? if it be, why have they not obtained it, ſince they can ſo eaſily do it? what made them ſo extreamly cautious in the *Council* of *Trent*, of meddling with any thing that was *in Controverſie among themſelves?* or was it, that they were all ſo much of a mind, that they had nothing to do, but to condemn their enemies? which was ſo far from being true, that there were very few things,

things, which came into debate, that they were agreed in; and therefore they were put sometimes to strange shifts, to find out general and ambiguous terms, which might not displease the *dissenters*, and yet leave the disputes as great as ever. They could not agree, so much as about the Title of the *Council*; many of the *Bishops* were for adding to the Title of *the most holy Council*, [*Representing the Church Universal*] which was eagerly opposed by the *Italians*, and with much ado avoided by the *Legats*; being no small controversie about words, but of very great consequence, about the *power* and *authority* of *Pope* and *Council*, if they had been suffered to go on in it. But the *Pope* hearing of this dispute, at the beginning, sent word to the Legats, *not to broach any new difficulties in matter of faith; nor to determine any of the things controverted among Catholicks, and to proceed slowly in the Reformation.* Excellent instructions, for the advancement of *Peace* and *Holiness!* Whoever will for that end peruse that incomparable history of the *Council*, will find how high the *Controversies* among themselves were, between the *Bishops* and the *Regulars* about *priviledges*; between the *Dominicans* and *Franciscans*, in many weighty points; between the *Italian Bishops* and others, about *Residence*, and the extent of *Episcopal power*; between the *Divines*, in most of the matters of doctrine; as might easily be shewed at large, if I loved the pains of transcribing; but I had rather referr the Reader, to that excellent history it self. I only renew my demand, why must no controversies among *Catholicks* be ended in the *Council?*

History of the Council of *Trent. l.* 2. *p.* 138.

p. 149.

could they be better decided any where else? if so, then the *Council* is not the best means of *Unity*; if not, then it seems there is no necessity of ending controversies among them, but they have *Unity* enough without it. And in truth, it is *Interest*, and not *Unity*, they look after; all such as hold opinions contrary to their *Interest*, must be proceeded against and condemned; but for others, let them quarrel and dispute as long as they will, they let them alone, if they touch not the *Popes Authority*, nor any of the gainful opinions and practices, which are allowed among them. And supposing their *Interest* be kept up, which the *Inquisition* is designed for, the *Court* of *Rome* is as great a *Friend* to toleration as may be; only what others call *different persuasions*, they call School points; and what others call *divisions*, they call *disputes*; the case is the same with their *Church* and others, only they have softer names for the differences among themselves; and think none bad enough for those, who cast off the *Popes Authority*, and plead for a *Reformation*. Here then lyes the profound mysterie of their *Unity*, that they are all agreed against us, though not among themselves; and are not we so against them too? May not we plead for the *Unity*, that they have, on the same grounds? We are all agreed against *Popery*, as much as they are against *Protestants*; only we have some *Scholastick disputes* among us, about indifferent things, and the *Episcopal Authority*, as they have; we have some zealous *Dominicans*, and busie and factious men, such as the *Jesuits* among them are; but setting aside these disputes,

we

we are admirably well agred, juſt as they are in the *Roman Church*.

§. 15. 2. They ſay, *they do not differ in matters of faith*. But this is as true, as the other; for are they agreed in *matters of faith*, who charge one another with *hereſie?* as we have already ſeen that they do. But if they mean, that they do not differ in *matters of faith*, becauſe thoſe only are *matters of faith*, which they are agreed in; they were as good ſay, they are agreed in the things they do not differ about: for the parties which differ, do believe the things in difference to be *matters of faith*; and therefore, they think differ from one another in *matter of faith*. But they are not agreed, what it is which makes a thing to be a *matter of faith*; and therefore no one can pronounce, that their differences are not about *matters of faith*; for what one may think not to be *de fide*, others may believe that it is; we ſee the *Popes perſonal infallibility* is become a *Catholick doctrine*, among the *Jeſuits*, and declared to be plain hereſie, by their Adverſaries. The deliverance of ſouls from *Purgatory* by the prayers of the living, is generally accounted a *matter of faith* in the *Roman Church*; but we know thoſe in it who deny it, and ſay it was a *novel opinion*, introduced by *Gregory* 1. againſt the conſent of *Antiquity* It is a *matter of faith*, ſ y the *Dominicans* and *Janſeniſts*, to attribute to God alone the praiſe of converting grace; and that grace efficacious by it ſelf, was the doctrine of *Fathers*, and *Councils*, and *the Catholick Church*; and is it not then a *matter of faith*, in

Their differences are in matters of faith.

in their opinion, wherein the *Jeſuits* and they differ from each other. To which purpoſe it was well ſaid, by the Author of a Book printed at *Paris*, A. D. 1651. containing *Eſſays* and *Reflections on the ſtate of Religion*; "that because of the Controverſies between the *Janſeniſts* and the *Jeſuits*, it might with more "reaſon be affirmed now, than in the time of "*Arrianiſm* it ſelf, *that the whole Church ſeems* "*to become heretical*. For admitting, ſaith "he, what is moſt certain, that the Church "hath decreed *Calviniſm*, *Pelagianiſm* and *Se*"*mi-pelagianiſm* to be *hereſies*; and that the "*Doctors* are thoſe who ſit in the *Chair* to be "conſulted withall upon points of Religion, "all *Catholicks* are reduced to a moſt ſtrange "perplexity. For if a man ſhall addreſs him"ſelf, to thoſe of the *Janſenian* party; they "will tell him, that thoſe who are termed *Mo*"*liniſts* are *Pelagians*, or at leaſt *Semi-pelagians*; "and on the other ſide, the *Moliniſts* will bear "him down, that their Adverſaries are *Calviniſts* "or elſe *Novatians*. Now all the *Doctors* of the "*Catholick Church* (a very few excepted) are "either of the one, or the other party. I "leave you then to conſider, to what prodigi"ous ſtreights mens minds are reduced, ſince "this is held as a general *Maxime* that whoſo"ever fails in one point of faith, fails in all. It is a matter of *faith*, ſay the *Dominicans*, *that all perſons*, *Chriſt only excepted*, *were born in ſin*, and therefore the contenders for the *Immaculate conception* muſt, in their judgement, differ in a *point of faith* from them. But if this diſtinction

ſhould

ſhould be allowed, to preſerve the unity of their Church; why ſhall it not as well cure the *diviſions* of ours The moſt conſiderable, in all reſpects, of the *diſſenters* from the *Church* of *England*, declare that they agree with us, in all the *Articles of doctrine* required by our *Church*; will this be enough in their opinion, to make us at *unity* with each other? if not, let them not plead the ſame thing for themſelves, which they will not allow to us. I cannot underſtand that the controverſies about *ceremonies* (conſidered in themſelves) among us, are of any greater weight, than the diſputes among the *Fryers*, concerning their *habits* have been; and yet this controverſie, only about the ſize of their *hoods*, laſted in one *Order*, almoſt an *Age* together; and was managed with as great a heat and animoſity, as ever theſe have been among us, and was with very much ado laid aſleep for a time, by the endeavours of four *Popes* ſucceſſively. But if this ſignifies nothing to *unity*, to ſay, *that the matters are not great about which the Controverſies are, if the diſturbances be great which are cauſed by them*; that will reflect more ſharply on their *Church*, than on ours, which hath ſo many differences which they account not to be about any *matters of faith*. But if theſe differences in point of doctrine among them prove to be none in *matters of faith*, it would be no difficult task, upon the ſame grounds, to ſhew that they have no reaſon to quarrel with us, for breaking the *unity* of their *Church*; becauſe then we may differ from them as little in *matters of faith*, as they do from one

one another. This I need not take upon me to ſhew at large, becauſe I find it already done to my hand by *F. Davenport*, *al. Sancta Clara* in his Paraphraſtical Expoſition of the 39. Articles of our *Church*: "about half of them, "he acknowledges to be *Catholicks* as they are, "without any further explication. The firſt "he meets with difficulty in, is that *about the* "*number of Canonical Books*, point blank againſt "the *Council* of *Trent*, but he acknowledges "that *Cajetan*, and *Franciſcus Mirandula*, fully "agree with our *Church* in it, who quote "*Hierom*, *Ruffinus*, *Antoninus*, and *Lyra* of "the ſame opinion, as they might have done "many others; but becauſe our *Church* doth "not caſt them wholly out of the *Canon*, he "dares not ſay it is guilty of *hereſie* ſimply; "and the rather, becauſe *Waldenſis* and *Driedo* "do hold, that it is only in the power of the "whole *Church* ſucceſſively from the *Apoſtles*, "to declare what Books are *Canonical*, and what "not. For the 11. Article about *Juſtification*, he "ſaith the Controverſie is only about words; "becauſe we are agreed, that *God* alone is the "efficient cauſe of Juſtification, and that *Chriſt* "and his Paſſion are the meritorious cauſe of "it; and the only queſtion is about the for-"mal cauſe, which our *Church* doth not attri-"bute to the act of faith, as he proves by the "Book of *Homilies*, but only makes it a con-"dition of our being juſtified; and they be-"lieve, that by faith we obtain our righteouſ-"neſs by *Chriſt*; ſo that he can find no difference "between them and us, in that point. He ſaith,

the

"the Controverſie about *merit* may be ſoon "ended, according to the doctrine of our "Church; for they deny as well as we Artic. 13. "*that any works done before the Grace of Chriſt, "and Inſpiration of his Spirit, can merit any "thing*, and when we ſay, Article 12. *that "good works which follow juſtification, are plea- "ſing and acceptable to God in Chriſt*; if by "that we mean, that they are accepted by "Chriſt in order to a reward, by vertue of the "promiſe of God through Chriſt, that is all "the ſenſe of merit, which he or the School of "*Scotus* contends for. For *works of Supereroga- "tion*, Article 14. he ſaith our *Church* con- "demns them upon that ground, *that men are "ſaid to do more by them than of duty they are "bounden to do*, which being generally under- "ſtood they condemn, he ſaith, as well as we; "becauſe we can do no good works, which "upon the account of our natural obligation "we are not bound to perform though by par- "ticular Precept we are not bound to them. In "the 19. Article where our Church ſaith, *that "the Church of* Rome *hath erred, not only in "their living and manner of ceremonies, but alſo "in matters of faith*; he diſtinguiſheth the par- "ticular *Church* of *Rome*, from the *Catholick "Church*, which is frequently underſtood by "that name; and he ſaith, it is only a matter "of faith to believe, that the *Catholick Church* "hath not erred, and not that the particular "*Church of Rome* hath not. In the 20. Article "our Church declares, *that the Church ought "neither to decree any thing againſt holy Writ*,

"ſo

"*ſo beſides the ſame it ought not to enforce any*
"*thing to be believed, of neceſſity to ſalvation*;
"this he interprets of what is neither actually
"nor potentially in the *Scriptures*, neither in
"terms nor by conſequence; and ſo he thinks
"it Orthodox, and not againſt traditions.
"Article 21. wherein our Church determines
"expreſly, *againſt the infallibility of general*
"*Councils*; he underſtands it, only of things
"that are not neceſſary to faith, or manners;
"which, he ſaith, is the common opinion
"among them. The hardeſt Article one would
think to bring us off in, was the 22. *viz.*
That the Romiſh doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, worſhipping and adorations, as well of Images, as of Reliques, and alſo Invocation of Saints is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture. But we need not deſpair, as long as one bred up in the *Schools* of *Scotus* deſigns our reſcue; "he con-
"feſſes it to be *a difficult adventure*, but
"what will not ſubtilty and kindneſs do to-
"gether? He obſerves very cunningly, that
"theſe doctrines are not condemned abſolute-
"ly and in themſelves, but only the *Romiſh*
"doctrine about them; and therein, we are
"not to conſider what the *Church* of *Rome*
"doth teach, but what we apprehend they
"teach, or what we judge of their doctrine,
"*i. e.* that they invocate *Saints*, as they do *God*
"himſelf; that *Purgatory* deſtroys the Croſs of
"*Chriſt*, and warms the *Popes Kitchin*; that
"Pardons are the *Popes* Bills of *Exchange*;
"whereby he diſcharges the *debts* of what ſin-
"ners

"ners he pleaſes; that they give proper *divine* "*worſhip* to *Images* and *Reliques*; all which, "he ſaith, are impious doctrines, and we do "well to condemn them. So that it is not "*want* of *faith*, but *want* of *wit*, this good "man condems us for, which if we attain to any competent meaſure of, whereby to underſtand their doctrine, there is nothing but abſolute *peace* and *harmony* between us. This grand difficulty being thus happily removed, all the reſt is done with a wet finger: for what though our *Church*, *Art.* 24. ſaith, *that it is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the cuſtom of the primitive Church to have publick prayer in the Church, or to Miniſter the Sacraments, in a tongue not underſtood of the people.* "Yet what can hinder a *Scotiſt*, from under-"ſtanding by the *Scripture*, not the doctrine "or command of it, but the delivery of it, "*viz.* that the *Scripture* was written in a "known tongue? nay he proves, that our "*Church* is for praying in *Latin* by this Ar-"ticle, becauſe that either is a *known tongue*, "or ought to be ſo, it being publickly taught "every where: and if it be not underſtood, he "ſaith, it is not *per ſe*; but *per accidens* that "it is ſo; I ſuppoſe he means, the *Latin tongue* is not to blame that the people do not underſtand it; but they, that they learned their *leſſons* no better at *School*. But what is to be ſaid for Women, who do not think themſelves bound to go to *School* to *learn Latin?* "He an-"ſwers very plainly, that S. *Paul* never meant "them, for he ſpeaks of thoſe who were to

"ſay

"ſay *Amen* at the Prayers; but both S. *Paul* "and the *Canon Law*, he *tells us*, forbid Wo- "men to ſpeak in the Church. The caſe is then clear, S. *Paul* never regarded what language the *Women* uſed; and it was no great matter, whether they underſtood their *Prayers* or not. But what is to be ſaid to the *Council* of *Trent*, which pronounces an *Anathema* to thoſe who ſay, that *Prayers* are to be ſaid only in a known Tongue? "This doth not "touch our *Church* at all, he thinks; becauſe, in "ſome *Colledges*, the Prayers are ſaid in *Latin*; "but although that be a known tongue there, "it is no matter, as long as the Council of "*Trent* hath put in the word *only*; that clears "our Church ſufficiently. Beſides the *Coun-* "*cil* of *Trent* ſpeaks expreſly of the *Maſs*, "which our Article doth not mention, but "only *Publick Prayers*: And the *Council* of "*Trent* ſpeaks of thoſe, who condemn it as "contrary to the *Inſtitution of Chriſt*; but "our *Church* only condemns it, as contrary to "the *Inſtitution* of the *Apoſtles*; but all the "commands of the Apoſtles are not the com- "mands of Chriſt, therefore our Church de- "clares nothing againſt *faith* in this Article. Are not we infinitely obliged to a man that uſes ſo much ſubtilty, to defend our *Church* from *error* in *faith?* But that which is moſt conſiderable is, what he cites from *Canus*, "that it is no Hereſie, to condemn a cuſtom or "Law of the Church, if it be not of ſomething "neceſſary to ſalvation; eſpecially if it be "a cuſtom introduced ſince the Apoſtles times,

"as

"as most certainly this was. For the five *Sacraments* rejected by our *Church*, *Art.* 25. he saith, "they are not absolutely rejected as Sa-"craments, but as Sacraments of the same "Nature with Baptism and the Lords Supper, "which they yield to. For *Transubstantiation*, which is utterly denyed by our *Church*, *Art.* 28. "he very subtilly interprets it, of a "carnal presence of *Christs* Body, which he "grants to be repugnant to Scripture, and to "destroy the nature of a Sacrament; but they "do believe Christs Body to be present, after "the manner of a Spirit, and so, our Church "doth not condemn theirs. As *to communion in both kinds*, asserted by our *Church*, *Art.* 30. he saith, "it is not condemned by the *Coun-"cil of Trent* therein, which only *Anathema-"tizes* those, who make it necessary to Salva-"tion, which our Church mentions not: and "however we condemn communion in one "kind, *Canus* proves him not to be guilty of "Heresie, who should say that the *Church* hath "erred therein. The 31 Article condemns *the Sacrifice of the Masse*, *i. e.* saith he, "indepen-"dently on the Sacrifice of the Crosse, which is "propitiatory of it self, and the other only by "vertue of it. The 32. of *the lawfulness of Priests Marriage*, "he understands of the *Law "of God*; in respect of which, it is the most "common opinion among them, he saith, "that it is lawful. The 34. *about Traditions*, "he interprets of those, which are not Do-"ctrinal. The Book of *Homilies* approved "*Art.* 35. he understands as they do Books

" approved by their Church, not of every ſen-
" tence contained therein, but the ſubſtance
" of the Doctrine; and he grants, there are
" many good things contained therein. For
" the 36. of *conſecration of Biſhops and Mini-*
" *ſters*, he proves from *Vaſquez*, *Conink*, *Ar-*
" *cudius*, and *Innocent* 4. that our Church hath
" all the eſſentials of *Ordination*, required in
" Scripture: and if the difference of form of
" words did null our Ordinations, it would
" do thoſe of the Greek Church too. The
laſt Article he examins is, *Art.* 37. *Of the Ci-*
vil Magiſtrates power, *in oppoſition to the Popes*
Authority; and he grants, " that the *King* may
" be allowed a *Supremacy*, *i. e.* ſuch as may
" not be taken away by any one, as his Supe-
" riour: and that by cuſtome, a ſufficient right
" accrues to him, over all *Eccleſiaſtical cauſes*:
" and that by divine and natural right, he
" hath juriſdiction over all *Eccleſiaſtical per-*
" *ſons*, ſo far as the publick good is concerned.
" And withal he grants, that we yield no ſpiri-
" tual juriſdiction to the King, and no more
" than is contended for by the *French*, and the
" *Parliament* of *Paris*. That part which de-
nyes the *Popes juriſdiction* in *England*, he ſaith,
" may be underſtood of the *Popes challenging*
" *England*, to be a *Fee* of the *Roman See*; but
" if it be otherwiſe underſtood, he makes uſe
" of many Scholaſtick diſtinctions of *actus ſig-*
" *natus & exercitus*, *&c.* the ſenſe of which
" is, that it is in ſome caſes lawful, for a tem-
" poral *Prince* to withdraw his obedience from
" the *Pope*; but leaves it to be diſcuſſed, whe-
" ther

"ther he had ſufficient reaſon for doing it. But there can be no *Hereſie* in matter of *fact*; it remains then, according to the ſenſe put upon our *Articles* by him with the help of his *Scholaſtick ſubtletics*, we differ no more from them in *points* of *faith*, than they do from one another. For ſuch kind of *diſtinctions* and *ſenſes* are they forced to uſe, and put upon each others opinions, to excuſe them from diſagreeing in *articles of faith*; and there is no reaſon that we ſhould not enjoy the benefit of them, as well as they: ſo that either they muſt be guilty of differing in *matters* of *faith*, or we are not.

§. 16. 3. They plead, that *their differences are only confined to their Schools, and do not diſturb the peace of the Church.* But there is as little truth in this, as there is *Unity* in their *Church:* as plainly appears, by what hath been ſaid already. Was the Controverſie, about the *Popes* temporal power, confined to the *Schools?* did not that make, for ſeveral *Ages*, as great diſturbances in the *Church*, as were ever known in it, upon any quarrel of *Religion?* Were the Controverſies, between the *Biſhops* and the *Monks*, confined to their Schools, about the extent of the Epiſcopal juriſdiction in former times, or in the renewing of this *Hierarchical Warr* (as one of the *Janſeniſts* calls it) in *France?* But theſe things are at large diſcovered already; I ſhall only adde one thing more, which ſeems more like a diſpute of the *Schools* between the ſeveral *Orders* among them, about *the immaculate* Their differences not confined to their Schools.

conception; and it will eaſily appear, that Wherever that diſpute began, it did not reſt in the *Schools*; if we conſider the *tumults* and *diſturbances* which have been made, only on the account of it. This Controverſie began in the *Schools*, about the beginning of the 14 Century; when *Scotus* ſet up for a new *Secti*, in oppoſition to *Thomas Aquinas*, and among other points of Controverſie, he made choice of this to diſtinguiſh his followers by; but propoſed it himſelf very timerouſly, as appears by his reſolution of it, in his Book on the *Sentences*; however, his followers boaſt, that in this bleſſed quarrel he was ſent for from *Oxford* to *Paris*, from *Paris* to *Cologne*, to overthrow all Adverſaries, and that he did great feates every where. But however this were, there were ſome not long after him, who boldly aſſerted what he doubtfully propoſed, of whom *Franciſcus Mayronis* is accounted the firſt; after him *Petrus Aureolus*, *Occam* and the whole order of *Franciſcans*. But the great ſtrength of this opinion lay not, in the wit and ſubtilty of the defenders of it, nor in any arguments from *Scripture* or *Antiquity*, but in that which they called the *Piety* of it, *i. e.* that it tended to advance the honour of the *B. Virgin*. For after the worſhip of her came to be ſo publick and ſolemn in their *Church*, I do not in the leaſt wonder, that they were willing to believe her to be *without ſin*. I much rather admire they do not believe all their *Canonized Saints*, to have been ſo too; I am ſure, the ſame reaſons will hold for them all. But this

Scot in 3. lib. ſent. diſt. 3. q. 1. n. 10

Apolog. pro vit. & morte. Joh. Duns Scoti.

Opinion

Opinion by degrees obtaining among the people, it grew ſcandalous for any man to oppoſe it. So *Walſingham* ſaith, towards the latter end of this Century, *the Dominicans Preaching the contrary opinion againſt the command, firſt of the Biſhops in* France, *and then of the King and Nobles; they were out-lawed by the King, and abſolutely forbid to go out of their own Convents, for fear of ſeducing the people; and not only ſo, but to receive any one more into their Order, that ſo the whole Order might in a little time be extinguiſhed.* The occaſion of this perſecution aroſe from a diſturbance, which happened in *Paris*, upon this Controverſie; one *Joh. de Monteſono* publickly read againſt the *immaculate conception*, at which ſo great offence was taken, that he was convented before the *Faculty* of *Sorbonne*; but he declared, that he had done nothing but by advice of the *chief* of his *Order*, and that he would defend what he had ſaid to death. His propoſitions were condemned, by the *Faculty* and the *Biſhop* of *Paris*; upon which he appeals to the *Pope*, and goes to *Avignon* to *Clem.* 7. where the whole *Order* of *Dominicans* appears for him, and the *Univerſity* againſt him by their *Deputies* of whom *Pet. de Alliaco* was the chief. The aſſertions which he was condemned for, relating to this matter, were theſe following, as they are written in a *Manuſcript* of *Petr. de Alliaco*, from which they are publiſhed by the late author of the *Hiſtory* of *the Univerſity of Paris.*

Walſingham hiſt. ieca A.D.1389.

Sext. Seculum univerſit. Pariſ. p.618.

1. To aſſert any thing to be true which is

againſt Scripture, is moſt expreſly contrary to faith. This is condemned, as *falſe, and injurious to the Saints and Doctors.*

2. That all perſons, Chriſt only excepted, have not derived Original ſin from *Adam*, is expreſly againſt faith. This is condemned as *falſe, ſcandalous, preſumptuous*, and *offenſive to pious ears.* Which he affirms particularly of the *B. Virgin*, and is in the ſame terms condemned.

3. It is as much againſt Scripture, to exempt any *one* perſon from Original ſin, beſides *Chriſt*, as to exempt *ten.*

4. It is more againſt Scripture, that the *B. V.* was not conceived in Original ſin, than to ſay, that ſhe was both in Heaven and on Earth, from the firſt Inſtant of her Conception or Sanctification.

5. That no exception ought to be allowed in explication of Scripture, but what the Scripture it ſelf makes. All which are condemned as the former.

Againſt theſe Cenſures he appeals to the *Pope*, becauſe therein *the doctrine of St.* Thomas, *which is approved by the Church, is condemned*; and that it was only in the *Popes power, to determine any thing in theſe points.* Upon this, the *Univerſity* publiſhes an *Apologetical* Epiſtle; wherein they declare, that they will rather ſuffer any thing, than endure *Hereſie* to ſpring up among them; and vindicate their own authority, in their Cenſures; and earneſtly beg the aſſiſtance of all the *Biſhops* and *Clergy* in their cauſe, and their care to ſuppreſs ſuch dangerous do-

doctrines; this was dated *Febr.*14. *A.D.*1387. But being cited to *Avignon*, thither they ſend the *Deputies* of the *Univerſity*, where this cauſe was debated with great zeal and earneſtneſs, about a years time; and at laſt, the *Univerſities* Cenſure was confirmed, and *Joh. de Monteſono* fled privately into *Spain*. But the *Dominicans* did not for all this, give over Preaching the ſame doctrine; upon which a grievous perſecution was raiſed againſt them, as appears, not only by the teſtimony of *Walſingham*, but of the continuer of *Martinus Foſſonus*; who ſaith, *that inſurrections were every where made againſt them, and many of them were impriſoned, and the people denyed them Alms and Oblations, and they were forbidden to Preach, or read Lectures, or hear Confeſſions, in ſo much that they were made*, he ſaith, *the ſcorn and contempt of the people*: and this ſtorm laſted *many years*; and there was none to help them: becauſe their enemies believed in perſecuting them, they did honour to the *B. Virgin*. Nay the *Kings* Confeſſour, the *Biſhop* of *Eureux*, was forced to recant, for holding with the *Dominicans*; and to declare, that their opinions were falſe, and *againſt faith*; and they made him upon his knees beg of the *King*, that he would write to the *King* of *Arragon* and the *Pope*, that they would cauſe *Joh. de Monteſono* to be ſent priſoner to *Paris*, there to receive condigne puniſhment. The next year, *A.D.*1389. they made *Adam de Soiſſons*, *Prior* of a *Dominican Convent*, publickly recant the ſame Doctrine before the *Univerſity*; and *Stephen Gontier* was

*V. Meyer. Annal. Fland. l.*14. *a.*1388.

sent Prisoner to *Paris* by the *Bishop* of *Auxerre*, as suspected of *Heresie*, because he joyned with his *Brethren* in the appeal to the *Pope*: and another, called *Johannes Ade*, was forced to recant four times, for saying that he favoured the opinions of *Joh. de Montesono*. But these troubles were not confined only to *France*, for not long after, *A. D.* 1394. *John* King of *Arragon* published a Proclamation, that no one under pain of Banishment should Preach or Dispute against the *immaculate Conception*: and in *Valencia*, one *Moses Monerus* was banished by *Ferdinand* on that account, because the *tumults* could not be appeased without it. *Lucas Waddingus*, in his *History of the Embassy about the immaculate Conception*, gives a short account of the *Scandals* that have happened, by the *tumults* which have risen in *Spain*, and elsewhere, on this Controversie; which he dares not relate at large, he saith, because of the *greatness of them:* such as happened in the *Kingdom* of *Valencia*, *A. D.* 1344. in the *Kingdom* of *Aragon*, *A. D.* 1398. in *Barcelona*, *A. D.* 1408. and 1435. and 1437. In *Catalonia*, *A. D.* 1451. and 1461. In all which, drawn from the *publick Records*, he saith, *the Princes were forced to use their utmost power, to repress them for the present, and prevent them for the future:* So in the *Kingdom* of *Murcia*, *A. D.* 1507. in *Bætica* or *Andaluzia*, *A. D.* 1503. in *Castile*, *A. D.* 1480. The like *scandals* he mentions in *Germany*, and *Italy*, on the same account; and withal he saith, *that these continued, notwithstanding all the endeavours of Popes, Princes, Bishops and Universities; but the*

Cavelli Rosar. B. Mariæ test. 14. *Secul. Wadding. Legatio de Concept. Sect.* 3. *tract.* 12. *S.* 1.

the tumults, he saith, *that happened of later years in* Spain, *were incredibly turbulent and scandalous; and drawn from the authentick Registers which were sent by the several Cities to the King, and by the King to the Pope; which were so great, that those alone were enough to move the Pope, to make a Definition in this Controversie.* Especially considering, that the same *scandals* had continued for 300. years among them, and did continue still, notwithstanding *Paul* 5th *Constitution.* Which is no wonder at all, considering what the *Bishop* of *Malaga* reports, that the *Jesuits* perswade the people *to defend the immaculate conception with sword and fire, and with their blood.* I now only desire to know, whether these be meer disputes of the *Schools* among them or no; and whether they have not produced as great *disorder* and *tumults* among the people, as *controversies* about *points* of *faith* are wont to do? So that upon the whole matter, whether we respect the *peace* of the *world*, or *factious* disputes in *Religion.* I see no advantage at all the *Church* of *Rome* hath above others; and therefore *reading* the *Scripture* can be no cause of the *divisions* among us; since there have been so many and great among those, who have most *prudentially dispensed* it, or rather, forbidden it to be read. Which was the thing I intended to prove.

Moral practice of the Jesuits. pag. 383.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

An Answer to the Remainder of the Reply.

The misinterpreting Scripture doth not hinder its being a rule of faith. Of the superstitious observations of the Roman Church. Of Indulgences; the practice of them, in what time begun; on what occasion, and in what terms granted. Of the Indulgences in Jubilees, in the Churches at Rome, *and upon saying some Prayers. Instances of them produced. What opinion hath been had of Indulgences, in the Church of* Rome: *some confess they have no foundation in Scripture, or Antiquity; others that they are pious frauds: the miserable shifts the defenders of indulgences were put to: plain evidences of their fraud from the Disputes of the Schools about them. The treasure of the Church invented by* Aquinas, *and on what occasion. The wickedness of men increased by* Indulgences, *acknowledged by their own Writers: and therefore condemned, by many of that Church. Of* Bellarmins *prudent Christians opinion of them. Indulgences no meer relaxations of Canonical Penance. The great absurdity of the doctrine of the Churches Treasure, on which Indulgences are founded, at large manifested. The tendency of them to destroy devotion, proved by experience; and the nature of the Doctrine.*

Of

Of Communion in one kind? no devotion in oppoſing an Inſtitution of Chriſt. Of the Popes power of diſpenſing contrary to the Law of God, in Oaths and Marriages. The ill conſequence of aſſerting Marriage in a Prieſt to be worſe than Fornication, as it is in the Church of Rome. *Of the uncertainty of faith thereon. How far revelation to be believed againſt ſenſe. The arguments to prove the uncertainty of the faith defended. The caſe of a revolter and a bred Papiſt compared, as to ſalvation: and the greater danger of one than the other proved. The motives of the Roman Church conſidered; thoſe laid down by* Biſhop Taylor, *fully anſwered by himſelf. An account of the faith of Proteſtants, laid down in the way of Principles: wherein the grounds and nature of our certainty of faith are cleared. And from the whole concluded, that there can be no reaſonable cauſe to forſake the communion of the Church of* England, *and to embrace that of the Church of* Rome.

§. 1. HAving thus far Vindicated the *Scriptures*, from being the cauſe (by being read among us) of all the *Sects* and *Fanaticiſms*, which have been in *England*; I now return to the conſideration, of the *Remainder* of his *Reply*. And one thing ſtill remains to be cleared, concerning the *Scripture*, which is, *whether it can be a moſt certain rule of faith and life, ſince among Proteſtants it is left to the private interpretation of every fanciful ſpirit:* which is as much as to ask, whether any thing can be a rule, which may

The miſinterpreting Scripture doth non hinder its being a rule of faith.

may be miſ-underſtood by thoſe who are to be guided by it? or, whether it be fit the people ſhould know the *Laws*, they are to be governed by; becauſe it is a dangerous thing to miſ-interpret *Laws*, and none are ſo apt to do it as the common people? I dare ſay, *St. Auguſtin* never thought, that *Hereſies ariſing from miſ-underſtanding Scriptures*, were a ſufficient argument againſt their being a *Rule* of *faith*, or being read by the people; as appears by his diſcourſing to them, in the place quoted by him. For then he muſt have ſaid to them to this purpoſe, "Good people, ye perceive "from whence Hereſies ſpring, therefore as "you would preſerve your ſoundneſs in the "faith, abſtain from reading the Scriptures, "or looking on them as your *rule*; mind the "Traditions of the *Church*, but truſt not "your ſelves with the reading what *God* "himſelf cauſed to be writ: it cannot be de-"nyed, that the *Scriptures* have far greater "excellency in them, than any other writ-"ings in the world, but you ought to conſider, "that the beſt and moſt uſeful things are the "moſt dangerous when abuſed. What is more "neceſſary to the life of man, than eating and "drinking; yet where lyes intemperance and "the danger of ſurfetting, but in the uſe "of theſe? What keeps men more in their "wits, than ſleeping; yet when are men ſo "lyable to have their throats cut, as in the "uſe of that? What more pleaſant to the "eyes, than to ſee the *Sun*; yet what is there "ſo like to put them out as to ſtare too long "upon

S. Auguſt. tract. 18. in Joh. cap. 5.

"upon him? Therefore ſince the moſt neceſ-
"ſary and uſeful things are moſt dangerous,
"when they are abuſed; my advice muſt be,
"that ye forbear eating, ſleeping, and ſeeing, for
"fear of being ſurfetted, murdred or loſing
"your ſight; which you know to be very bad
"things. I cannot deny, but that the *Scri-*
"*ptures* are called *the bread of life*, the *food of*
"*our ſouls*, the *light of our eyes*, the *guide of*
"*our wayes*; yet ſince there may be ſo much
"danger in the uſe of *food*, of *light*, and of a
"*Guide*, it is beſt for you to abſtain from them.
Would any man have argued like *St. Auguſtin*, that ſhould talk at this rate? yet this muſt have been his way of arguing, if his meaning had been to have kept the people from reading the *Scriptures*, becauſe Hereſies ariſe from miſ-underſtanding them. But all that he inferrs from thence, is what became a wiſe man to ſay, viz. *that they ſhould be cautious, in affirming what they did not underſtand; and that* hanc tenentes regulam ſanitatis, *holding this ſtill as our rule of ſoundneſs in the faith, with great humility; what we are able to underſtand, according to the faith we have received, we ought to rejoyce in it as our food, what we cannot, we ought not preſently to doubt of, but take time to underſtand it; and though we know it not at preſent, we ought not to queſtion it to be good and true:* and afterwards ſaith, *that was his own caſe, as well as theirs.* What! *S. Auguſtine*, a *Guide* and *Father* of the *Church*, put himſelf equal with the people in reading and underſtanding *Scriptures!* In which we not only ſee his humility, but how far

far he was from thinking, that this argument would any more exclude the people from reading the *Scriptures*, than the great *Doctors* of the *Church*. For I pray, were they the common people, who first broached Heresies in the Christian *Church?* Were *Arius*, *Nestorius*, *Macedonius*, *Eutyches*, or the great abettors of their Doctrines, any of the *Vulgar?* If this argument then holds at all, it must hold especially against men of parts and learning, that have any place in the *Church*; for they are much more in danger of spreading *Heresies*, by mis-interpreting *Scriptures*, than any others are. *But among Protestants*, he saith, *Scripture is left to the Fanciful interpretation of every private Spirit.* If he speaks of our *Church*, he knows the contrary; and that we profess to follow *the unanimous consent of the primitive Fathers* as much as they, and embrace the doctrine of the *four General Councils*. But if there have been some among us, who have followed their own *Fancies* in interpreting *Scripture*; we can no more help that, than they can do in theirs; and I dare undertake to make good, that there have never been more absurd, ridiculous, and Fanciful Interpretations of *Scripture*, than (not the common people, but) the *Heads* of their *Church* have made, and other persons in greatest reputation among them. Which though too large a task for this present design, may ere long be the subject of another.

For *the authority of Henry* 8. in the testimony produced from him, when they yield to it in the point of *Supremacy*, we may do it in the

six

six articles or other points of *Popery*, which he held to the last. But we think it an advantage to our cause, in the matter of *Supremacy*, that they who were *Papists* in other points, as well as this against *reading the Scriptures*, yet contended so earnestly against the *Popes* Authority, as *Henry* 8. and *Stephen Gardiner*, *Bonner*, and the rest did. Doth he imagine that *Henry* 8. is owned by us, to be *Head* of our *Church*, as the *Pope* is with them, so as to think him *infallible?* He *would* be *Head* of the *Popish Church* in *England*, in spight of the *Pope*; but he never pretended to be *Head* of the *Reformation*, any farther than the *Supremacy* went; and if they will not believe him, when he was influenced, as they think, by *Cranmer*; neither are we to be tyed to his opinion, when he was guided by *Stephen Gardiner*, or any other; who were not greater enemies to *Cranmer*, than to the *Reformation*.

Of their superstitious observations.

§. 2. The next thing, wherein I said the sincerity of devotion is much obstructed in their Church, was by the multitude of superstitious observations, never used in the primitive Church, as I said I was ready to defend; to this his answer is very short. 1. That I *should have said to prove*; but so weak was I, as to think the Affirmative was to be proved, and the Negative defended. 2. *He denyes any such to be used in their Church.* I desire then to know his opinion, of baptizing bells with God-fathers and God-mothers, holding the rope in their hands; being buried in a Monks habit, Pilgrimages to images of Saints; sprinkling holy water; spittle

ſpittle and ſalt in baptiſme; their rites of exorciſm; *Agnus Dei's*; the Pageantry of the Paſſion-week; the carrying about of the Hoſt; the numbering of Ave Marias and Pater Noſters, to make Roſaries and Pſalters of the B. Virgin; the burning tapers at noon day, particularly on Candlemas day with great devotion; the incenſing of images, with many others which might be mention'd: and if he can vindicate theſe from *ſuperſtition*, it will be no hard task to *vindicate* the *Heathens*, in the ceremonies of their devotion; and to prove, that there can be no ſuch thing as *Superſtition* in the world.

Of Indulgences.

§. 3. I now come to the groſs abuſe of the people, in *Pardons* and *Indulgences*; by which I ſaid the ſincerity of devotion was much obſtructed among them: he tells me, *as an eye-witneſs, that there is great devotion cauſed by them, in Catholick Countries; there being no Indulgence ordinarily granted, but enjoyns him that will avail himſelf of it, to confeſs his ſins, to receive the Sacraments, to pray, faſt and give alms; all which duties are with great devotion*, he ſaith, *performed by Catholick people, which without the incitement of an Indulgence had poſſibly been left undone.* I will not be ſo troubleſome to enquire, what ſincerity of devotion that was he was an eye-witneſs of, which was cauſed by Indulgences; nor what ſort of perſons they were, who were thus devout at receiving them. I think it will be ſufficient for my purpoſe to prove, that no perſons in the world, who underſtand what Indulgences mean,

mean, in the *Church* of *Rome*, can be excited to any *devotion* by them; but that on the contrary, they tend exceedingly to the obſtructing of it: which I ſhall do by ſhewing, that either they are great and notorious cheats, if that be not meant by them which is expreſſed in them; or if it be, that nothing could be invented that tends more to obſtructing their own way of devotion, than theſe do. 1. That they are great and notorious cheats, if that be not meant by them which is expreſſed in them. For which we are to underſtand firſt, what hath been expreſſed in their *Indulgences*. 2. What opinion thoſe of their own *Church* have had concerning them.

The practice of Indulgences.

§. 4. 1. What hath been expreſſed in their Indulgences; the eldeſt *Indulgences* we meet with, are thoſe which were made by the *Popes*, to ſuch who undertook their quarrels againſt their enemies; and the firſt of this kind I can meet with is, that of *Anſelm Biſhop* of *Luca Legat* of *Gregory* 7. which he gave to thoſe of his party, who would fight againſt the *Emperour Henry* 4. which *Baronius* relates from his *Pœnitentiary*; in which was promiſed *remiſſion of all their ſins*, to ſuch who would venture their lives in that *Holy* War. And *Gregorius* 7. himſelf in an epiſtle to the *Monks* of *Marſeilles*, who ſtuck cloſe to him, promiſed an *Indulgence of all their ſins*. The like *Indulgence* with *remiſſion of all their ſins*, was granted to thoſe who would fight againſt the *Saracens* in *Africa*, by *Victor*, who ſucceeded *Gregorius* 7.; after him followed *Urban* 2. who granted an

Baron. ad A.D. 1084. *n.* 15.

Greg. 7. *l.* 6. *Ep.* 15.

Leo Caſin. hiſt. l. 3. *c.* 71.

Indulgence to all, who would go in the War to the Holy Land, of *all their sins*; *and* as *Gul. Tyrius* saith, *expresly mention'd those, which the Scripture saith do exclude from the Kingdom of God, as murder, theft,* &c. and not only absolved them, from all the penances they deserved by their *sins*; but *bid them not doubt of an eternal reward after death*, as *Malmsbury* saith; the like is attested by *Ordericus Vitalis*, in whose younger dayes this *Expedition* began: *upon which* he saith, *all the thieves, Pyrats, and other Rogues, came in great numbers, and listed themselves, having made confession of their sins*; and if we believe *S. Bernard*, *there were very few but such among them; which he rejoyceth very much in*: and saith, *there was a double cause of joy in it, both that they left the Countries where they were before, and now went upon such an enterprise which would carry them to Heaven.* This way of *Indulgences*, being thus introduced, was made use of afterwards, upon the like occasions by *Callistus* 2. A. D. 1122. by *Eugenius* 3. A. D. 1145. by *Clem.* 3. A. D. 1195. and others after them; who all promised the *same Indulgences, that Urban* 2. *had given.* And it is well observed by *Morinus*, that these *Indulgences* cannot be understood, of a meer relaxation of *Canonical penances*; because such a *remission of all sins is granted, upon which eternal life* follows, and therefore must respect *God*, and not barely the *Church*: and because *absolution* was to be given upon them, which saith he, *according to the discipline then in the Church, ought*

Gu. Tyrius l. 1. hist. Orient.

Will. Malm. l. 4. c. 2. Order. Vitalis hist. Eccles. ad A. D. 1095.

Bernard. Exhort. ad milit. templi c. 5.

Morinus de Sacram Pœnit. l. 10. c. 22.

not

not to be given, but till the Canonical Penance had been gone through, or at leaſt the greateſt part of it. But therein he is very much miſtaken, when he ſaith, *that the Popes never granted theſe plenary Indulgences, but only to encourage an Expedition to the Holy Land:* For *Gelaſius* 2. A. D. 1118. granted the ſame to the Chriſtian ſouldiers, at the ſiege of *Saragoza*; as appears by the *Bull* it ſelf, in *Baronius*. *Honorius* 2. in the quarrel he had with *Roger* of *Sicily*, gave the ſame to all, who having confeſſed their ſins ſhould dye in the War againſt him; but, if they chanced to eſcape with their lives, but half their ſins were pardoned. *Alexander* 3. gave to his *Friends* at *Ancona*, who ſhould viſit the 12. *Churches* and their own Cathedral all Lent Faſting, as *full an Indulgence, as if they went to Hieruſalem*; and beſides this, every firſt *Sunday* in the month as great an *Indulgence*, (*i. e.* I ſuppoſe, for as many dayes) *as a man could take up ſands in both hands.* This *Baronius* thinks a little too much: and therefore rejects it as fabulous, becauſe the ſame *Pope*, in an *Indulgence* given to the *Church* of *Ferrara*, grants but *a year of criminals, and a ſeventh part of venials*; but he doth not conſider, that the caſe of *Ancona* was peculiar, becauſe of the great friendſhip that City had ſhewn to the *Pope* in his diſtreſs; and this *Indulgence* was tranſcribed from a very ancient *Manuſcript*, and better atteſted than many other things, which he never diſputes. But if it be a *cheat* let it paſs for one; and it is no great matter to me, whether it were a *cheat* of the *Popes*, or

Cap. 23.

Baron. ad A.D. 1118. *n.* 31.

Id. ad A.D. 1127. *n.* 5.

Id. ad. A.D. 1177. *n.* 8.

Id. ad. A.D. 1177. *n.* 76.

Ad A. D. 1179. *n.* 7. the *Church* of *Ancona*. But he doth not at all question the *Indulgence* granted by the same *Pope*, to those who would take up arms against the *Albigenses*, which to those who dye in that cause, is not only *pardon of all their sins*, but *an eternal reward:* but for such as refused to go, no less than excommunication is denounced against them. And *Honorius* 3. in the same cause, granted an *Indulgence* in the same terms, as to those who went to the *Holy Land:* and *Gregorius* 9. to all who should take his part against the *Emperour Frederic* 2. which *Bzovius* confesseth to be usual with the *Popes* to give, to those *who would fight against Saracens, hereticks or any other enemies of theirs.*

Bzov. ad A. D. 1219. *n.* 3.

Id. A. D. 1239. *n.* 8.

Ad A. D. 1208. *n.* 5.

This practice of *Indulgences*, being once taken up, was found too beneficial to be ever let fall again; and private *Bishops* began to make great use of it, not in such a manner as the *Popes*, but they were unwilling not to have as great a share as they could get in it, thence they began to publish *Indulgences*, to those who would give money towards the building or repairing *Churches*, or other publick works; for this, they promised them a pardon of the 7. or 4. or 3. part of their *sins*, according as their bounty deserved. This was first begun by *Gelasius* 2. for the building of the *Church* of *Saragoza* A. D. 1118. and was followed by other *Bishops*; in so much that *Morinus* is of opinion, that *Mauricius Bishop* of *Paris* built the great *Church* of *Nostredame* there, in that manner; and he saith, *he can find no ground for this practice of Indulgences, before the* 12. *Century*, and

Morinus de Pœnitent. l. 10. *c.* 20.

and answers *Bellarmins* arguments, for a greater antiquity of them; and proves all his testimonies, from *Gregories Stations*, *Ludgerus* his *Epistle*, and *Sergius* his *indulgence* in the *Church* of *S. Martin* at *Rome* produced by *Baronius*, to be meer *impostures*. But the *Bishops* of *Rome*, finding how beneficial these *Indulgences* were, soon resolved to keep the *keys* of this *Treasury* of the *Church*, in their own hands; and therefore quickly abridged other *Bishops* of this power; and made great complaint, that *by the indiscreet use of Indulgences by the Bishops, the keys of the Church were contemned and discipline lost*; so *Innocent* 3. in the *Council* of *Lateran*, can. 62.; and therefore decrees, that in the dedication of a Church, though where there were several *Bishops* together, they should not grant any *Indulgence* above a year, nor any single *Bishop* above 40. dayes. But we are not to imagine, that the *Popes* ever intended to *tye their own hands*, by these *Canons*; but they were too wise, to let others have the managing of so rich a stock, as that of the *Church* was; which would bring in so great a harvest, from the *sins* of the people. Thence *Boniface* 8. first instituted the year of *Jubilee* A. D. 1300; and in his *Bull* published for that end, grants not only a *plenary*, and *larger*, but *most plenary remission of sins* to them, that (if *Romans* for 30, if strangers for 15. dayes in that year) should *visit the Churches of the Apostles.)* This was brought afterwards by *Clem.* 6. to every 50. years; and since, to 25. or as often as his *Holiness* please: but in all of them, a *most plenary remission of sins* is granted. It were

Baron. ad A. D. 847.

Extravag. Comm. l. 5. *tit.* 9. *c.* 1. *Brov. ad* A. D. 1300. *n.* 1

worth the while to understand the difference between a *plenary*, *larger* and *most plenary Indulgence*: since *Bellarmin* tells us, *that a plenary Indulgence takes away all the punishment due to sin.* But these were the fittest terms to let the people know, they should have as much for their money as was to be had, and what could they desire more? And although *Bellarmin* abhorres the name of *selling Indulgences*, yet it comes all to one; the *Popes* gives *Indulgences*, and they give money; or they do it not by way of *purchase*, but by way of *Alms*: But commend me to the plain honesty of *Boniface 9.* who being not satisfied with the oblations at *Rome*, sent abroad his *Jubilees* to *Colen*, *Magdeburg*, and other Cities; but alwayes sent his Collectors, to take his share of the money that was gathered, and inserted in them that Clause, *porrigentibus manus Adjutrices*, which in plain English, is *to those who would give money for them*: without which no *Indulgence* was to be had, as *Gobelinus Persona* saith: Who likewise addes this remarkable passage, that the Preachers of the *Indulgences* told the people, to encourage them to deal for them, that they were not only *à pœnâ* but *à culpâ* too, *i. e.* not meerly from the temporal punishment of sin, but from the fault it self which deserved eternal; this made the people look into them, and not finding those terms but only a *most plenary remission*, they were unsatisfied, because they were told that the fault could be forgiven by *God* alone; but if they could but once find that the *Pope* would undertake to clear all scores with *God* from

Bell de Indul. l. 1. c. 9.

Gobelin. Persona Cosmodr. at. 6. c. 86.

for them, they did not doubt but they would be worth their money. Whereupon he ſaith *thoſe very terms were put into them:* then the wiſer men thought theſe were counterfeit, and made only by the Pardon-mongers; but upon further enquiry they found it otherwiſe. How far this trade of *Indulgences* was improved afterwards, in the time of *Alexander* 6. and *Leo* 10. the *Reformation* which began upon occaſion of them, will be a laſting monument; which was the greateſt good the world ever received by them.

§. 5. But we are not to think, ſince *Indulgences* are ſuch great kindneſſes to the ſouls of men, that they ſhould be only reſerved for years of *Jubilee*; for what a hard caſe may they be in, who ſhould chance to dye but the year before? Therefore the *Popes* thoſe tender Fathers of the Church) have granted very comfortable ones, to many particular places, and for the doing ſome good actions, that no one need be in any great perplexity for want of them. Other places it is probable a man may go to *Heaven* aſſoon from as *Rome*, but there is none like that for eſcaping *Purgatory*; if a man confeſs his ſins, and but ſtumble into one of the ſeven *Churches*, it is a hard caſe if he doth not eſcape, at leaſt for one thouſand years. I need not reckon up, what vaſt *Pardons* are to be had there at eaſie rates; ſince they have been ſo kind at *Rome*, to publiſh a *Catalogue* of them, in ſeveral books; an extract out of which, is very lately ſet forth in our own language. Thoſe who have gone about to compute them, have found that

Of Indulgences at Rome.

Hen Foulis Preface to the Hiſtory of Romiſh uſurpations. *Bell. de Indulg. l. 2. c. 20.*

Indulgences for a *million* of years are to be had at *Rome* on no hard terms: *Bellarmin* would seem to deny these pardons for so many years, as far as he durst, as though they were not delivered by *Authentick* writers; but I desire no more than what *Onuphrius* hath transcribed, from the *Archives* of the *Churches* themselves; and we may judge of the rest by what *Cæsar Rasponi*, a *Canon* of the *Lateran Church* and a present *Cardinal*, hath written lately of that one *Church*, in a book dedicated to *Alexander 7.* He tells us therefore, *there is so vast a bank of the Treasure of the Church laid up there, that no one need go any further to get full pardon of all his sins; and that it is impossible for any one, to reckon up the number of the benefits to be had there by it.* In the *Feast* of the *Dedication* of that *Church*, at the first throw, if a man be well confessed before, he gets, if he be a *Roman*, a pardon of a 1000. years, if a *Tuscan* 2000; but if he comes from beyond sea 3000. years; this is well for the first time. The like *Lottery* is again at that Church, on *Cœna Domini*. But *Boniface 9.* would never stand indenting with men for number of years, but declares, *if men will come either for devotion or pilgrimage,* (no matter which) *he shall be clear from all sin:* and what would a man have more? But besides this, there are other particular seasons of opening this *Treasury*; and then, one may take out as much as they can wish for: As when the *Image* of our *Saviour* is shewn, all that come thither, *have their sins pardoned* infallibly: and many other dayes in the year; which

Onuphrius de 7. urbis Ecclesiis. Cæsar Rasponi de Basilicâ Lateranensi. l. 2. c 14. p. 204.

which the Author very punctually reckons up, and are so many that a *Canon* of that *Church* may dispose of some thousands of years, nay *plenary remissions*, and yet escape *Purgatory* at last himself. But besides what belongs to the *Church* it self, there is a little *Oratory* or *Chappel* belonging to it, called the *Holy of Holies*, where it is impossible for any man to reckon up the number of *Indulgences* granted to it. These vast numbers of years then are no fiction of *Pardon-mongers*, as *Bellarmin* is sometimes readay to say; unless he will have the *Popes* called by that name, or charge the *Holy Churches* at *Rome*, with so gross impostures,

Respon. de Basil. Later. l. 4. c. 18.

§. 6. But suppose it should be a mans fortune never to see *Rome* (as it hath many a good mans) must he be content to lye and rot in *Purgatory*, or trust only to the kindness of his Friends? no, we that live at this distance, have some comfort left: there are some good *prayers*, appointed for us to use, which will help us at a need; or else the book of the *houres* of the *B. Virgin*, *secundum usum Sarum*, is strangely mistaken; but herein I am likewise prevented, by the author of the *preface* lately mentioned; but my edition being elder than either of those mentioned by him seems to have something peculiar to it, or at least omitted by him.

Of Indulgences for saying some prayers.

As when it saith of the Prayer *Obsecro te Domina Sancta Maria, &c.* **Who all them that be in the state of Grace, that daily say devowtelt this prayer before owre blessed Lady of pity she wolle showe them her blessed bysage, and warn them the day and owre of deth;**

Horæ B. V. Mariæ. secundum usum Sarum. p. 38.

deth, and in there last end, the Angells of God shall yield there soules to heaven, and he shall obtayn 5 hundreth yeres, and soo many Lentris of pardon, graunted by 5 holy Fathers Popes of Rome. That is pretty well for one prayer!

But this is nothing to what follows, to a much shorter prayer than that.

Pag. 42. Our Holy Father Sixtus 4. Pope hath graunted, to all them that deboutly say this prayer before the Image of our Lady in the sone cleven thousand years of pardon. A prayer said to good purpose! I confess I can hardly stoop now, to those that have only dayes of pardon promised them; yet for the sake of the procurer, I will mention one.

P. 45. Our Holy Father Pope Sixtus hath graunted at the Instance of the highmost and excellent Princesse Elizabeth late Quen of Englond and wyfe to our Soberaign liege Lord King Henry the 7th. God habe mercy on her sweet soull, and all Cristen soulls that every day in the morning after 3 tollinges of the Abe bell say 3 times the hole salutation of our Lady Ave Maria gratiâ, that is to say, at 6 the klock in the morning 3 Abe Maria, att 12 of the klock at none 4 Abe Maria and att 6 a klock at eben, for every time so doing, is graunted of the spiritual treasour of holy Church 3 hundreth dayes of pardon totiens quotiens. To which is annexed, the pardon of the two Arch-bishops and nine Bishops, forty dayes a piece, three times a day, which begun, *A. D.* 1492. the seventh year

year of *Henry* 7. And the ſumm of the Indulgence and pardon for every *Ave Maria*, is 800 dayes *totiens quotiens*.

But if a man thinks himſelf well provided already, and hath a mind to help his Friends, there is nothing like the 15. O. s of St. *Brigitt*.

Thys be the 15 O. O s. the which the holy Virgin S. Bryggytta was woonte to ſay dayle, before the holy rode in S. Pauls Church at Rome; who ſoe ſays this a yere, he ſchall deliver 15 ſoulles out of Purgatory of his next kyndren, and conbert otyer 15 ſinners to gode lyf and other 15 righteous men of his kynd ſhall perſebere in gode lyf. And that ye deſyre of God ye ſchall habe it, if yt be to the ſalbation of your ſowle. P. 50.

Not long after, we find a better endowment with number of years, than any we have yet met with.

To all them that before this Image of pytie deboutly ſay 5 Pater Noſter and 5 Aves and a Credo, pityouſly beholding theſe Armes of Cryſtys paſſion, are graunted thirty two thouſand ſeben hundred and fifty years of pardon; and Sixtus the 4. Pope of Rome hath made the 4 and the 5 prayer, and hath doubled his forſaid pardon. P. 54.

The Prayer with *Boniface* 6. his *Indulgence of ten thouſand years pardon*, will hardly down with me now: much leſs that niggardly grant of *John* 22. of a *hundred dayes pardon*. What cuſtomers doth he hope to find at ſuch ſordid rates? P. 58.

Sixtus 4. for my money; witneſs this Indulgence.

Our

P. 61. **Our holy Father Sixtus 4. graunted to all them that beyn in state of Grace, sayeing this prayer following, immediately after the elebation of the body of our Lord clene remission of all their sins perpetually enduring. And also John the 3 Pope of Rome, at the request of the Quen of England, hath graunted unto all them that deboutly say this prayer before the Inimage of our Lord Crucified, as many days of pardon as there were wounds in the body of our Lord in the tyme of his bitter passion, the which were 5365.**

It is well *Sixtus* came after him, or else his market had been spoiled, the other so much out-bid him.

Next to clean pardon, *John* 22. offers fair; only the task is somewhat harder, it being for three Prayers.

P. 66. **Thys 3 prayers be wrytton in the Chappelle of the holy crosse in Rome, otherwise called** Sacellum sanctæ Crucis 7 Romanorum, **who that deboutly say them shall obtayn 90000 years of pardon for dedly sins, graunted by our holie Father Joh. 22. Pope of Rome.**

Methinks he should have made them up a full hundred thousand, when his hand was in; but I perceive they are *prudential*, in dispensing *Pardons* as well as *Scripture*.

But there is odd condition implyed in some of these prayers, called *being in a state of Grace*, the want of which may hinder the effect of them; but although due confession with absolution will at any time put a man into it, yet is

there

there no remedy without it? we will try once more for that, and end these *Indulgences*. And I think the prayer of S. *Bernardine* of *Siens* will relieve us.

Thys most deboutly prayer sayd the holy Father S. Bernardine daylie knæling in the worshyp of the most holy name Jesus. And yt is well to beliebe that thzough the inbocation of that most excellent name of Jesu, S. Bernard. obtayned a singular reward of perpetual consolation of our Lozd Jesu Chzist. And thys prayer is wzitten in a Table that hangeth at Rome in S. Peters Church nere to the high awter, there as our holy Father the Pope duely is wonte to say the office of the Masse. And bo that deboutly with a contrite heart daply say this Mzyson, yf he be that day in the state of eternal damnation, than this eternal payne shall be chaunged him in tempozal payne of Purgatozy, than yf he hath deserbed the payne of Purgatozy, yt shall be fozgotten and fozgiben, thozow the infinite mercy of God. P. 72.

This is enough of all reason.

And so much shall serve, to set forth what the *practice* of *Indulgences* hath been in the *Church* of *Rome*, and what is expressed in them.

§. 7. 2. I now come to give account, what opinion hath been had of these *Indulgences* in their own Church; wherein some have freely confessed, they have no Foundation in *Scripture* or *Antiquity*; others, that they are only *pious frauds*, and those who have gone about to defend them, have been driven to *miserable shifts* in the defence of them. What opinion hath been had of Indulgences in the Roman Church.

1. Some

1. Some have confessed, that they have no foundation in *Scripture*, or *Antiquity*. *Durandus* saith, *that very little can be affirmed, with any certainty, concerning Indulgences; because neither the Scripture speaks expressly of them, and the Fathers*, Ambrose, Hillary, August., Hierome *speak not at all of them*: and therefore he hath no more to say, *but that the common opinion is to be followed herein.* The same is said, by another *School-man*; who adds this, *that though it be a Negative argument, yet it is of force, because in the time of those Fathers they were very much skilled in the Scriptures; and it were very strange, if Indulgences were to be found there, that they did not find them.* This is likewise affirmed by *Cajetan*, *Dominicus Soto*, and all those who assert that the use of *Indulgences* came into the *Church*, upon the *relaxing the severity of the primitive discipline*; which they say continued in use, for a 1000 years after *Christ*. But the most express testimonies in this case, are of *Bishop Fisher*, who saith *that the use of Indulgences came very late into the Church*; and *of Polydore Virgil*, following his words; and of *Alphonsus à Castro*, who ingenuously confesseth, *that among all the controversies he writes of, there is none which the Scripture or Fathers speak less of, than this*; *but however*, he saith, *though the use of them seem to have come very late into the Church, they ought not to be contemned; because many things are known to latter ages, which the ancient writers were wholly ignorant of*; *for which he instanceth in Transubstantiation, procession from the Son, and Purgatory.*

Durand. in sentent. l. 4. dist. 20. q. 3.

Joh. Major in sent. l. 4. dist. 20.

Cajetan opusc. de Indulgent. init.

Soto in sent. l. 4. dist. 20.

Greg. de Valent. de Indulg. c. 4.

Estius in sent. l. 4. dist. 20. S. 2.

Morinus de pœnitent. l. 10. c. 20. n. 9.

Roff. c. Luther. art. 18.

Polyd. Virgil. de Invent. l. 8. c. 1.

Alphons. à Castro. adverf. hæres. l. 8. v. Indul.

But

But he ought to have remembred what himſelf had ſaid before, in a chapter of *finding out hereſies*; that, *the novelty of any doctrine makes it of it ſelf to be ſuſpected, becauſe Chriſt and his Apoſtles did give ſufficient inſtruction for attaining eternal life; and after the Law given by Chriſt, no other Law is to be expected, becauſe his Teſtament is eternal.* Let this be applyed to his own confeſſion of theſe doctrines, and the conſequence is eaſily diſcerned. And it is an excellent ſaying of *Bellarmin*, that, *in things which depend on the will of God, nothing ought to be affirmed, unleſs God hath revealed it in the H. Scriptures.* Therefore, according to the opinion of theſe perſons, who aſſert the doctrine of *Indulgences* to have no *Foundation* in *Scripture* or *Antiquity*, it can be no other than a *notorious Cheat.*

Alphonſ. l. 1. c. 12.

Bellar. de amiſſ gratiæ l. 6. c. 3. reſp. ad obj. 6.

2. Some in the Church of *Rome*, have called them *pious frauds.* This appears, by the Controverſies which aroſe upon *Indulgences*, at the ſame time when they began to grow common. For *Aquinas* and *Bonaventure* tell us, *that there were ſome in the Church who ſaid, that the intention of the Church in Indulgences was only by a pious fraud to draw men to charitable acts, which otherwiſe they would not have done; as a mother which promiſeth her Child an apple to run abroad, which ſhe never gives him, when ſhe hath brought him to it.* Which is the very inſtance they uſed, as *Gregory de Valentia* confeſſeth. But this *Aquinas* rejects, as a very dangerous opinion; *becauſe this is in plain terms, to make the Church guilty of a notorious*

Aquin. ſupplement. ſum. q. 25. art. 2. Bonavent. in ſent. l. 4. diſt. 20. q. 6.

Greg. de Valent. de Indulg. c. 2.

notorius Cheat; *and as*, he saith, *from St.* Augustine, *if any falshood be found in Scripture, it takes away the authority of the whole*; *so if the Church be guilty of a cheat in one thing, she will be suspected in all the rest.* This, saith *Bonaventure, is to make the Church to lye and deceive, and Indulgences to be vain and childish toyes.* But for all these hard words, they had a great deal of reason on their side: for the *Indulgences* were expres for the remission of the sins of those who did such and such things, as the giving a small summ of money towards the building of a Church, or an *Hospital*; they therefore asked *whether the Indulgences were to be taken as they were given or no?* if they were, then all those had *full remission of sins*, on very easie terms; if not, then what is this else but *fraud* and *cheating*; and can be only called *pious*, because the work was good which they did? This put the defenders of *Indulgences* very hard to it; *Præpositivus*, one of the eldest of the *Schoolmen*, confesseth *that it looks a little oddly for a man to be absolved from all his sins for three pence, given in three several places*; *and that the rich by this means have a mighty advantage over the poor*: but he resolves it all *into the power of the Church*. *Petrus Cantor* confesseth the difficulties great, but *only for the Churches Authority*; and especially in those general *Indulgences* which are pronounced without any distinctions. Therefore he saith *Greg.* 4. as he calls him (*Morinus* thinks *Greg.* 8.) in the Dedication of the *Church* of *Benevento*, told the people, *it was much safer for them to undergo their penance*,

Apud. Morin. l. 10. *c.* 20. *n.* 5.

Ib. n. 7.

penance, than to receive an Indulgence from him of any part of it: and another *Bishop*, being desired an *Indulgence* would give it but for two dayes; but if any one asks, whether the remission of sins were presently obtained after *Indulgence*, or only when they are uncapable of penance, *viz.* after death; *for his part*, he saith, *he desires them to consult the Pope or the Bishop that gives the Indulgence, whether of these opinions is true*; and when the *Bishop* of *Paris* shewed him the magnificent *Church* he had built by vertue of Indulgences, *Cantor* told him, *he had done much better if he had let them alone, and perswaded the people to undergo their penance.*

But because the form of *Indulgences* ran in such large and general terms; it grew to be a great *Question*, among the *Schoolmen, Whether the validity of Indulgences was as great, as the words of them?* which in other terms is, whether the *Church* did cheat or not, in giving them? for if they were not to understand them, according to the plain words of them; what is this but a *gross imposture* to abuse the credulous people, and laugh in their sleeves at them for their simplicity. For while the people have so good an opinion of their *Church*, as to believe the truth of what she declares, and to take *Indulgences* according to the sense of the words; if their meaning who give them be otherwise than is expressed, it is one of the most abominable *cheats* that ever was invented by men. For picking purses, forging deeds, or betraying men are tolerable things in comparison; but to abuse and ruine their souls, under a pretence of par-

doning their ſins, is the utmoſt degree of fraud and impoſture. Let us now ſee how theſe *Huckſters* defend their *Church* in this caſe; for the *Queſtion* hath been debated among the *Schoolmen*, euer ſince *Indulgences* came up. Some reſolve it thus; that *Indulgences* do ſignifie as much as the *Church* declares, but with theſe conditions; that there be ſufficient authority in the giver, neceſſity in the receiver, that he believes the Church hath power to give them, that he be in a ſtate of grace, and give a ſufficient compenſation; which is to overthrow what they ſaid, unleſs thoſe conditions were expreſſed in the Indulgences. Some ſay, that common Indulgences held only for ſins of Ignorance; others, for venial ſins; others, for penances negligently performed; others, for Purgatory pains. Some again ſaid, that theſe could ſignifie no more than a relaxation of *Canonical Penance*, whatever the words were, and that they were introduced for no other end; and they do not reach any farther, than the *Churches Canonical power* or judgement doth, and not to the judgement of God. But this opinion, ſaith *Greg. de Valentiâ* doth not differ from the *Hereticks*; and *withall*, he ſaith, *upon this principle, Indulgences do no more hurt than good; for if it were not for them, the ſinner by his penance might take away ſome part of his puniſhment; but now he relyes upon his Indulgence, and does no penance, and ſo undergoes his whole puniſhment.* *Albertus M.* ſaith, *they are much miſtaken, who ſay that Indulgences are to be underſtood as large as their words are, without any farther condition; and that this is to enlarge*

Guil. Altiſſiodor. ſum. l. 4. tract. 6. c. 9.

Morin. l. 10. c. 21. n. 3.

Greg. de Valent. de Indulg. c. 2.

Albert. M. in ſent. l. 4. diſt. 20. art. 17.

enlarge the Court of Gods mercy too far and ſayes many conditions are to be underſtood, which are not expreſſed in them. This gave the firſt occaſion to the *Treaſure* of the *Church*, invented by *Aquinas* to ſatisfie this argument of *Albertus*, concerning the mercy of *God* being extended too far by *Indulgences*; for hereby, what puniſhment is taken away from one is made up by the puniſhment of another, which is reckoned upon his account. And therefore, he ſaith, the cauſe of the remiſſion of puniſhment is not the devotion, work, or gift of the receiver, but the Treaſure of merits which was in the *Church*, which the Pope might diſpenſe; and therefore the quantity of the remiſſion was not to be proportioned to the *acts* of the receiver, but to the *ſtock of the Church?* This rich *Banck* of the Churches Stock being thus happily diſcovered, they do not queſtion now, but to ſet all accounts even with it; and therefore *Aquinas* confidently affirms, *that Indulgences are to be underſtood ſimply, as they are expreſſed*; *for God*, ſaith he, *doth not need our lye or deceit*; *which he grants muſt have been, if Indulgences had not been meant as they were expreſſed*; *and all men would ſin mortally, who Preached Indulgences. Yet to obtain the Indulgence*, he ſaith, *that every man muſt give according to his ability*; for the objection being put, concerning an *Indulgence* being given to three ſeveral places, that whoſoever gives a penny towards the building of a Church in every one of theſe places, ſhall for each of them have the third part of his ſins forgiven him, ſo that for three pence a man gets a

plenary remiſſion; he anſwers, *that a poor man may indeed have it ſo, but it is to be underſtood that a rich man ought to give more.* For it is all the reaſon in the world, that a rich man ſhould pay greater *Uſe* for the *ſtock* of the *Church*, than a poor man can do: and it is reaſonably to be preſumed, that he had more ſins to be pardoned, than the other; and therefore, whatever the general terms are, there muſt be ſome reſerve to hook in more from the rich, than was expreſſed in the firſt bargain. But if the rich man ſhould plead *Law* in the caſe, and cry out it was *Covin* and *Fraud*, to demand more than the *firſt Contract* was; I am not skilful enough to determine, what *action* the *Church* can have againſt him. But there is another ſhrewd objection, mentioned by *Bonaventure*; which is, *that a man gets by ſinning*, as ſuppoſe two men to receive the remiſſion of a *third part* of their ſins by an *Indulgence*, one owes but it may be 90 years penance for his ſins, and another hath run upon the ſcore ſo far that he owes 900 years, both receive a third part *Indulgence*; in which caſe, we ſee plainly the greater ſinner hath mightily the advantage of the other, and where one gets but 30 the other gets 300. And therefore *Bonaventure* is fain to run back again, and to ſay, *that Indulgences are not to be underſtood as they are expreſſed, and that they are not equal to all; but it was not fit to expreſs it ſo, becauſe this would hinder peoples eſteem of the Indulgence.* Which in plainer terms is, that it is neceſſary to *cheat* the people, or elſe there is no good to be done by *Indulgences.*

Thence

Thence *Petrarch* called them *nets, wherein the credulous multitude were caught*; and in the time of *Boniface* 9. the people, obſerving what vaſt ſumms of money were gathered by them, cryed out they were *meer cheats* and *tricks* to get money with; upon which *Paulus Langius* (a *Monk*) exclaims; *O God, to what are theſe things come! Thou holdeſt thy peace but thou wilt not alwayes; for the day of the Lord will bring the hidden things of darkneſs to light. Conrad. Urſpengenſis* ſaith, *that* Rome *might well rejoyce in the ſins of the people, becauſe ſhe grew rich by the compenſation which was made for them: Thou haſt* (ſaith he to her) *that which thou haſt alwayes thirſted after; ſing and rejoyce, for thou haſt conquered the world, not by religion, but by the wickedneſs of men. Which is that which draws them to thee, not their devotion and piety. Platina* ſaith, *the ſelling Indulgences brought the Eccleſiaſtical Authority into contempt, and gave encouragement to many ſins. Urſpergenſis* complains, *that plenary Indulgences brought more wickedneſs into the world; for,* he ſaith, *men did then ſay, Let me do what wickedneſs I will, by them I ſhall be free from puniſhment, and deliver the ſouls of others from Purgatory. Gerſon* ſaith, *none can give a pardon for ſo many years, as are contained in the Popes Indulgences, but Chriſt alone:* therefore what are they but cheats and impoſtures? In *Spain, Indulgences* were condemned by *Petrus de Oſma*, a *Divine* of *Salamanca*, and his followers, as appears by the *Popes Bull* againſt them, *A.D.* 1478. In *Germany* by

Petrarch. ep. 5.

Gobel Perſona et. 6. *c.* 68.

Paul. Langii Chronic. Citinenſ. ad A.D. 1395.

Urſperg. Chron. p. 307.

Platina in Bonif. 9.

Urſperg. Chron. p. 322.

Gerſon. de Indulg. conſid. 8.

Bull. Rom. Tom. 1. *Sixt.* 4. *Conſt.* 17.

Serrar. Rerum Moguntiac. l. 1. c. 34.

Johannes de Veſaliâ, a famous Preacher of *Mentz*; for *Serrarius* reckons this among the chief of his opinions, *that Indulgences were only pious frauds, and wayes to deceive the people, and that they were fools who went to* Rome *for them.* About the ſame time flouriſhed *Weſſelus Groningenſis*, incomparably the beſt Scholar of his Age, and therefore called *Lux mundi*; he was not only skilled in *School Divinity* (almoſt the only learning of that time) but in the *Greek*, *Hebrew*, *Chaldee* and *Arabick*, having travelled into *Greece*, *Ægypt*, and been in moſt *Univerſities* of *Europe*, and read the moſt ancient Authors, in all kinds of learning; on the account of his learning, he was much in favour with *Sixtus* 4. and was preſent and admired at the *Council* of *Baſil*; but he was ſo far from being a friend to *Indulgences*, that in his Epiſtle he ſaith, *that no Popes could grant an Indulgence for an hour, and that it is a ridiculous thing to imagine that for the ſame thing done, ſometimes an Indulgence ſhould be granted for 7 years, ſometimes for 700, ſometimes for 7000, and ſometimes for ever by a plenary remiſſion; and that there is not the leaſt foundation in Scripture, for the diſtinction of remitting the fault and the puniſhment, upon which the doctrine of Indulgences is founded. That the giving them, was a deſign of covetouſneſs; and although the Pope once ſware to the King of* France's *Embaſſadour, that he did not know the corruptions of the ſellers of Indulgences, yet when he did know them he let them alone, and they ſpread farther. That God himſelf doth not give plenary remiſſion to contrition and confeſſion,*

Weſſeli Groning. oper. p. 867, &c.

confeſſion, and therefore the Pope can much leſs do it: But if God doth forgive, how comes the Pope to have power to retain? and if there be no puniſhment retained when God forgives, what hath the Pope to do to releaſe? Againſt him writes one *Jacobus Angularis*; he confeſſeth, *there is nothing in Scripture or Antiquity expreſly for Indulgences; but that ought to be no argument, for there are many other things owned in their Church, as neceſſary points, which have as little foundation as this,* viz. *S.* Peters *being at* Rome, *and Sacramental confeſſion; and therefore at laſt he takes Sanctuary in the Popes and Churches authority.* To this *Weſſelus* anſwers, "that Indulgences were accounted *pious frauds*, "before the time of *Albertus* and *Thomas*; that "there was a great number of *Divines*, did "ſtill oppoſe the errours and practices of the "*Court* of *Rome*, in this matter; that ſup-"poſing the Church were for them, yet the au-"thority of *Scripture* is to be preferred before "it, and no multitude of men whatſoever is "to be believed againſt *Scripture*: that, he had "not taken up this opinion raſhly, but had "maintained it in *Paris* thirty three years be-"fore, and in the *Popes* pœnitentiary Court at "*Rome*, and was now ready to change it, if he "could ſee better reaſon for the contrary. That "the doctrine of *Indulgences* was delivered very "confuſedly and uncertainly, by which it ap-"peared to be no *Catholick doctrine*: that it is "almoſt impoſſible to find two men agree, in the "explication of them; that the doctrine of *In-"dulgences* was ſo far from being firmly believed

Jac. Angular. in ep. Weſſel.

" among them, that there was not the ſtricteſt " perſon of the *Carthuſian* or other orders " that ſhould receive a *plenary Indulgence* at the " hour of death, that yet would not deſire his " *Brethren*, to pray for his ſoul; which is a " plain argument, he did not believe the vali- " dity of the *Indulgence*: that many in the " *Court* of *Rome* did ſpeak more freely againſt " them, than he did. That, the *Popes* authori- " ty is very far from being *infallible*, or being " owned as ſuch in the *Church*; as appeared by " the *Divines* at *Paris*, condemning the *Bull* of " *Clement 6.* about *Indulgences*, wherein he " took upon him to *command* the *Angels*, and " gave *plenary remiſſions* both from the *fault* " and *puniſhment*. Which authentick *Bulls*, he " ſaith, were then to be ſeen at *Vienne*, *Limoges* " and *Poictou*. It is notorious to the world, what complaints were made in *Germany*, after his time, of the *fraud* of *Indulgences*, before any other point of *Religion* came into diſpute; and how neceſſarily from this, the *Popes* authority came to be queſtioned, that being the only pretence they had to juſtifie them by: and with what ſucceſs theſe things were then managed, it is no more purpoſe to write now, than to prove that it is day at Noon. The *Council* of *Trent* could not but confeſs *horrible abuſes*, *in the ſale of Indulgences*; yet what amendment hath there been, ſince that time? *Bellarmin* confeſſeth, *that it were better if the Church were very ſparing in giving Indulgences:* I wonder why ſo, if my Adverſaries experience and obſervation be true, *that they*

Bell. de Indulg. l. 1. c. 12.

they prove great helps to devotion and charity. Can the *Church* be too liberal in thoſe things which tend to ſo good an end?

Of *Bellarmins* prudent Chriſtian.

§. 8. But *Bellarmin would not have the people too confident, of the effects of Indulgences; for though the Church may have power to give them, yet they may want their effect in particular perſons; and therefore,* ſaith he, *all prudent Chriſtians do ſo receive Indulgences, as withall to ſatisfie God themſelves for their ſins, i. e.* in plain terms, that all *prudent Chriſtians* are too wiſe to believe them, and none but *Fools* do rely on them. For if there were any thing but *fraud* and *impoſture* in them, why may not a *prudent Chriſtian* truſt a Church, which he believes infallible? If the Head of the Church publiſhes an Indulgence, wherein he remits to all that are confeſſed and contrite, upon doing ſuch actions of charity and piety the remaining temporal puniſhment of their ſins: I deſire to know why a *prudent Chriſtian* of that *Church* may not, yea ought not, to rely upon his word? Doth he ſuſpect the *Head* of his *Church* may cheat and abuſe him? if he doth, what becomes of infallibility? if he verily believes that the *Pope* cannot erre and will not deceive, why muſt not his word be taken? and how can his word be taken for the remitting of a debt, when they take as much care of payment, as if he had ſaid nothing? I know not how thoſe things paſs among the *prudent Chriſtians* of that *Church*, but to me they look like the greateſt ſuſpicion of a *cheat* that may be. As ſuppoſe a great perſon out of kindneſs to one

one that is in danger of lying in Prison for debt, gives him a note under his hand, that upon the acknowledgment of his debt to his Attourney, and paying him his *Fees*, he will see his debt wholly discharged; and a Friend of the Prisoner tells him *openly*, he ought to receive that Favour in an extraordinary manner, with all thankfullness; for that person is one, who can never fail of his word; and he need not question his ability, for he hath a vast *treasure* in his hands, to be disposed of for such uses; can we otherwise think, but that the poor man would be strangely surprised with joy at it; and if he hath any money left, he will be sure to give it to the person imployed in so good a work? But withall if he should *secretly* whisper him, that he advises him as a Friend, that he would look out all other ways imaginable to satisfie his Creditours, and that all *prudent persons*, in his case, had taken the same Course; what must the thoughts of such a man be, of such a large and noble offer? Truly, that the Gentleman was a great Courtier, but a man must have a care of believing him too farr; and his Friend understood the world, and that one thing was to be said and done in *Shew*, not to disoblige so great a person; but for all that, a man must mind his own business, or he may be chouſed at last, if he trust too far to such large promises. This is just the case of *Indulgences* in the *Roman Church*; a man is affrighted with the dreadful Prison of *Purgatory*, as the temporal punishment of his sins, which God will certainly exact from him, either here by satisfactions and penances, or there

there in the pains of that ſtate; while the man conſiders with himſelf the hardneſs of his condition, he hears of *Indulgences* to be had; and after he hath enquired the meaning of them, is very well ſatisfied, that if he can get one of them, he ſhall do well enough. For he is told that his *Holineſs* is *infallible*, and that he cannot cheat or lye, or deceive like other men; and therefore, of all perſons in the world, he would ſooneſt truſt him; but becauſe many others are in the ſame condition with him, he may a little queſtion, whether his *ſtock* will hold out or no: here, his friends aſſure him the *Treaſure* of the *Church*, (of which the *Pope* hath the *Keys*) is ſo large, that if it were a thouſand times more, he need not fear it; only he muſt confeſs his ſins, and have contrition for them, and do ſome charitable acts, and pay ſome cuſtomary fees and duties, and he ſhall have a total diſcharge. Well, ſayes the man, in a tranſport of joy, this is the braveſt *Church* in the world for a man to *ſin* in, if he may eſcape thus: and what need I queſtion, ſince the *Pope* is *infallible*, and the treaſury of the *Church* is inexhauſtible? how am I freed now, not only from the fears of *Hell* and *Purgatory*, but from crabbed and hateful penances? that honeſt and kind-hearted Gentleman, the *Pope*, hath ſtruck a *tally* for me in his *Exchequer*, and I ſhall have my ſhare in my courſe and order; without laſhings, and whippings, and faſtings, and mumblings, and I know not how many odd tricks beſides: but *ſoft and fair*, ſaith *Bellarmins* prudent *Chriſtian* to him; be not too confident of your eaſe

eaſe and diſcharge, you muſt uſe as great ſeverities with your ſelf, and undergoe as many penances, and ſay as many Prayers as if you had no *Indulgence* at all. Say you ſo, I pray what benefit then have I, ſaith he, by this which you call an Indulgence? what is it an Indulgence of? Is there not a *full remiſſion of ſins* contained in it; and I have been always told, by that is meant the diſchage of the temporary puniſhment due to ſin, either here, or in Purgatory? Shall I be diſcharged, or ſhall I not upon it? if I ſhall, what do you tell me of that which I am diſcharged from? if not, the *Indulgence* is a *ſpiritual Trepan*, and the *Pope* an *Infallible Cheat*. I cannot ſee how a man can think otherwiſe, that made ſuch account of the great benefit of *Indulgences*, and at laſt finds they come to nothing, but deceiving the people, and getting money.

The abſurdity of the doctrine of Indulgences, and the Churches Treaſure.

§. 9. By this we ſee already, what miſerable ſhifts they are put to, who defend *Indulgences* but as an *honeſt contract*, but they who will juſtifie them, as containing ſomething divine and ſatisfactory for the puniſhment of mens ſins, are fain to build the doctrine of them upon ſuch abſurd and unintelligible notions, that it is almoſt as hard to underſtand, as to believe it. It cannot be denyed, that there are ſome in the *Church* of *Rome*, whoſe doctrine of *Indulgences* is eaſie enough, but then it marrs the whole Market, and this doctrine is therefore condemned by others as *heretical in ſenſe*: Which is, that *Indulgences* are nothing elſe but a *relaxation of the ancient ſeverity of Church diſcipline*, according

Caſſander in conſult. art. 12. *Barns Cathol. Rom. Pacific.* S. 9. *White de medio adm. ſtatu. dom.* 26.

according to the old Penitential Canons; which doth not reſpect the juſtice of God, but the Diſcipline of the *Church* over offenders. This is a doctrine we have nothing to complain of the difficulty of underſtanding, but we know not to what purpoſe, (if this be all) any particular *Indulgences* are ever given; ſince there is ſo general an *Indulgence*, by the practice of the whole *Church*, among them; wherein, they cannot pretend to obſerve any of the old *Penitential Canons*. And to give a man an *Indulgence*, to omit that which no body requires and is wholly out of uſe, would be like the Kings giving a man a *Patent*, not to wear *Trunk-hoſe* and *Ruffs*, when it would be ridiculous to uſe them. And if this were all intended, why is it not ſo expreſſed if they meant honeſtly? but they know, if their *Pardons* ran ſo, no one would give a farthing for them. What need any talk of the *Churches Treaſure*, for this? which *Clement. 6.* made the ground of *Indulgences* in his *Bull*: and hath been aſſerted, by the moſt zealous defenders of them. This way of explaining *Indulgences* then, though it be eaſie and intelligible, yet it is not reconcileable with the practice of the *Church* of *Rome*; nor with the ſuppoſitions, on which that practice is built. We are therefore to enquire, what they can make of it, who go about to defend it, as it is practiſed, and generally underſtood among them. To this end they tell us, "that although the fault be remitted, "upon the Sacrament of Penance; yet the tem- "poral puniſhment of ſin remains, which God "muſt be ſatisfied for: that this temporal "puniſhment

" punishment is either to be undergone here, or " in *Purgatory*; that every man must have un- " dergone it himself, if there had not been a " *treasure* of the *Church* made up of the satis- " factions of *Christ*, and the *Saints*, to make " amends to *God* for every one, to whom that " Treasure is applyed. That, the dispensing of " this Treasure is in the hands of the *Pope*, who " gives it out by *Indulgences*; which being ap- " plyed to any person, upon the condition requi- " red, he is thereby discharged from the debt " of temporal punishment, which he owed to " God.

This is the received doctrine of *Indulgences*, in the *Roman Church*; which holds together till you touch it, and then it presently flies in pieces like a *Glass drop*, or vanishes into smoke and aire. It is of so tender a composition that it can endure no rough handling; if you like it as it is, much good may it do you, but you must ask no *Questions*: But however, I shall; to shew the monstrous absurdities of this Doctrine.

1. Why, if the *Indulgence* only respects the *punishment* and not the *fault*, the terms of the Indulgence do not express this, that the people may not be deceived? Why in all *Indulgences* since this doctrine is so explained, as in the *Jubilees* of *Clement* 8. and of *Urban* 8. (the former of whom is applauded by *Bellarmin*, for a reformer of Indulgences) the most general expressions are still used of most *plenary Indulgence, remission* and *pardon of all their sins*? why it is not said only of the *temporal punishment due*

Clem. 8. const. 58. To. 3. Bull. Urban. 8. const. 16. To. 4.

to

to ſin, the fault being ſuppoſed to be remitted?

2. How *puniſhment* doth become due, when the *fault* is remitted? if the *puniſhment* be juſt, it muſt have reſpect to the *fault*; for to *puniſh* without *reſpect* to the *fault* is all one, as to *puniſh* without *fault*; if it have reſpect to the *fault*, how that fault can be ſaid to be remitted, which is puniſhed? So far as a man is puniſhed, it is nonſenſe to ſay he is pardoned; and ſo far as he is not pardoned, his fault is charged upon him.

3. Suppoſe temporal puniſhment remain to be ſatisfied for; whether all, or only ſome one kind? whether diſeaſes, pains, and death, be not part of the *temporal puniſhment* of ſin; and whether men may be freed from theſe, by *Indulgences?* whether from the effects of the juſtice of *God*, in extraordinary judgements? if not, how can a man be ſaid to be freed from the temporal puniſhment of ſin, that is as lyable to it as any one elſe?

4. If only one ſort of the temporal puniſhment of ſin, why is not that *one ſort* declared what it is, that all men may be ſatisfied from the *Pope* himſelf, whom ſome believe infallible, in his *Indulgence?* Others we find, are not agreed about it; ſome ſay, it is only the puniſhment due to ſin above the *Canonical penance*; ſome, that it is only the *Canonical penance*, and not that which is due from the juſtice of *God*; ſome that it is for both, ſome only for negligence in performing penance; ſome that it is only for injoyned penance, and others that it is for

all that may be adjoyned. In this diverſity of opinions, what ſecurity can any man have, what puniſhment he is to be freed from?

5. If it be from *Canonical penance*, whether a man is wholy freed from the obligation to that, or no? if he be, what power hath the *Prieſt*, to enjoyn *penance* after? if he be not free, what is it he is freed from? and in what tolerable ſenſe can this be called a *moſt full remiſſion of ſins*, which neither remits the *fault*, nor the *natural* or *divine puniſhment*, nor ſo much as the *Canonical penance* enjoyned by a *Prieſt*?

6. Although there needs no *treaſure*, where nothing is diſcharged; yet ſince ſo great a one is ſpoken of for this purpoſe, wherein the ſatisfaction of *Chriſt* bears the greateſt ſhare; it were worth the enquiring why the ſatisfaction of *Chriſt* might not as well remit the temporal puniſhment, when the fault is remitted on the account of it, as afterwards by *Indulgences*?

7. How the parts of *Chriſts* ſatisfaction come to be divided, into that which was *neceſſary*, and that which was *redundant*; ſo as the neceſſary ſatisfies for the fault, and the redundant, for the temporal puniſhment? whether *Chriſt* did any more, than *God* required? whether any thing which *God* required, can be ſaid to be redundant? if there be, how one part comes to be applyed, and the other caſt into a *treaſure*? what parts can be made, of an infinite and entire ſatisfaction? and if ſo little were neceſſary, and ſo much redundant, how the leaſt

part

part comes to satisfie for the fault and eternal punishment; and the greatest, only for the temporal punishment?

8. Whether all the satisfaction of *Christ* taken together, were not great enough to remit the eternal punishment of the whole world? if it were, whether all the *redundant* parts of that, be cast into a *treasure* too? and who hath the keeping of it, and what *use* is made of so much more useful a *treasure*, than that which serves only to remit the temporal punishment? What account can the *Pope* give, of suffering so vast a part of the *Churches Treasure* to lye idle, and make no use of it for the benefit of those that need it?

9. May not the *Pope*, if he thinks of it, gather another mighty *Treasure* of the *absolute Power of God*, which is never used, as for making new worlds, *&c?* may he not, by the help of this, deliver souls out of hell, as well as by the other out of *Purgatory?* and if this be so much the greater kindness, he ought to think of it, and imploy this treasure for these purposes. Why may he not think of another treasure, of the *light* of the *Sun* that is more than enough for the use of the world, and lay it up in store, for the benefit of the purblind and Aged?

10. If the satisfaction of *Christ*, be so redundant; how comes it not to be sufficient, for so poor an end as *Indulgences* serve for; but the satisfactions of the *Saints* must make up a share, in this *Treasure* too? Is not this worse, than to light a Candle to help the Sun, to suppose *Christs* satisfaction so infinite, as to

be sufficient to redeem more worlds; and yet not enough to deliver from temporal punishment, without the satisfactions of the *Saints*?

11. How come the *Saints*, to make such large satisfactions to the *justice* of *God*, if the *satisfaction* of *Christ* were of so infinite a nature? and if they did make satisfactions, were they not sufficiently rewarded for them? if they were, how come those satisfactions, to help others, which they were so abundantly recompensed for themselves?

12. If the satisfaction of *Christ* doth only obtain grace for the *Saints*, to satisfie themselves for the temporal punishment of their sins; how can the application of this satisfaction by *Indulgences*, free any from the temporal punishment of their sins? Or have the satisfactions of *Saints*, being joyned with *Christs*, greater power now in common penitents, than the satisfaction of *Christ* alone in the greatest *Saints*?

13. Why the satisfaction of *Christ* may not serve, without the *Saints*, to remit only the temporal punishment of sins; when it was sufficient alone, to remit both eternal and temporal in the *Sacrament* of *Baptism*? or was the force of it spent then, that it needs a fresh supply afterwards? but if then it could be applyed to a higher end, without any other help, why not where it is to have far less efficacy?

14. If satisfaction be made to *God*, for the temporal punishment of penitents, by *Indulgences*; I desire to know, when and by whom the *payment* is made to *God*? If it was made by the

the perſons, whoſe ſatisfactions make the *Churches* treaſure, for that end, what hath the *Pope* to do to diſpenſe that, which *God* hath accepted long agoe for payment? If it be made by the *Pope*, in what way doth he make it? doth he take out ſo much ready *caſh* of the *Churches* treaſure, and pay it down upon the nail, according to the proportion of every ones ſins? or doth he only tell *God*, where ſuch a *treaſure* lyes, and bid him go and ſatisfie himſelf, for as much as he diſcharges of his debt?

15. How came this *Treaſure* of the *Church*, into the *Popes* Keeping? who gaue him alone the *Keys* of it? if there were any ſuch thing, methinks thoſe, who are truſted with the greater treaſure of *Chriſts neceſſary* ſatisfaction for the remitting of eternal puniſhment, as every *Prieſt* is by their own doctrine in the *Sacrament* of *Penance*, ſhould not be denyed the leſſer, of the *Superfluities* of *Chriſt* and the *Saints* ſufferings, for the remitting only temporal puniſhment. When I once ſee theſe queſtions ſatisfactorily anſwered, I may then think better of this doctrine, than I do at preſent; for the beſt I can think of it now is, that there never was a doctrine more abſurd in the ground of it, or more gainful in the practice, than this of *Indulgences* in the *Roman Church*; and therefore ought to be accounted one of the moſt notorious *cheats*, that ever was in the *Chriſtian* world.

§. 10. But let us ſuppoſe it otherwiſe, and then we are to enquire, whether this would tend to promote or obſtruct that very way of devotion, which is moſt in requeſt in the *Roman* The tendency of Indulgences, to hinder devotion.

man Church? there are but two wayes to judge of this, either by *experience*, or the *nature of the doctrine* it self. For *experience*, my Adversary alledges *his own*, and *that he hath seen great devotion caused by them:* but by his favour the question is not, what outward acts of devotion may be performed by some ignorant and silly people, who are abused by great hopes of strange benefits by *Indulgences*, and therefore prepare themselves with some shew of devotion to receive them, especially when they are unusual; but the question is, whether they have these effects, upon those who understand the nature and designe of them, and the doctrine of their *Church* about them. For as *Durandus* resolves it, *the validity of the Indulgence doth not depend, on the devotion of the receiver; for then, saith he, the Indulgence would contain a falsity in it, which is, that whosoever doth such a thing, as going to the seven Churches, shall have plenary remission of his sins; therefore* saith he, *whoever doth the thing, shall have the whole benefit of the Indulgence, or else the Indulgence is false.* And to his *experience*, I shall oppose, that of greater observers of the world, than he hath been. I have already mentioned the testimony of *Urspergensis*, and others, concerning the effects of plenary Indulgences in their times; how men encouraged themselves to sin the more, because of them. *Polydore Virgil* observes, *that when Indulgences were grown common, many men did abstain less from doing evil actions.* The author of the Book, called *Onus Ecclesiæ* saith, *that they*

dus and. in sentent. l. 4. dist. 20. q. 4.

Polyd. virg. de invent. r. l. 8. c. 1.

Onus Eccles. c. 14. S. 28

they take men off from the fruits of repentance, and are profitable only to the idle and wicked. The *Princes* of *Germany*, in the *Diet* of *Norimberg* among the grievances represented to the *Pope*, by the consent of them all; upon the mention of *Indulgences* reckon, as the least bad consequence of them, *that the people were cheated of their money by them*; but that they say was far more considerable, *that true Christian Piety was destroyed by them*; *and that all manner of wickedness did spring from thence*; *and that men were afraid of committing no kind of sin, when at so cheap a rate they could purchase a remission of them.* But setting aside the experience of these things, let us consider what the nature of the doctrine it self tends to, to those who believe it. The least benefit we see allowed them, is a freedom from *enjoyned penances*; and what are these *penances* accounted among them, but *fruits of true repentance*, a severe mortification, fasting, frequent prayers and Almes? so that the short of this doctrine is, that men by *Indulgences* are excused from doing the best parts of their *Religion*, and if this be a way of promoting devotion, I leave any one in his senses to judge. *Centum gravamina art.* 3. 4.

§. 11. I proceed now to *the denying the Cup to the Laity*, contrary to the practice of the *Church* in the solemn celebration of the Eucharist, for a thousand years after Christ. To which he answers 3. wayes (1) *that the receiving in one or both kinds was ever held a matter of liberty in the Church.* (2) *that it was as much in the Churches power to alter it after a thousand years, as in the first or second century,* (3) *that the* Of communion in one kind.

believing whole Christ to be present in one kind, tends more to excite devotion, than receiving both elements without that belief. This is the substance of his answer. But I have else where at large proved, and need not repeat it here, that the Institution of Christ, as to both kinds, was of an universally obligatory nature, not only from the will of the first Institutor, but from the universal sense of the *Church* concerning the nature of that Institution. And there I have largely answer'd, those very testimonies produced by him, and shewed, that they are so far from proving the use of one kind in the *Catholick Church*, that *Leo* in that very place shewes, that *it was the token of an heretick not to receive in both kinds*; and the other Instance, in the *Greek Church*, is only of a woman in whose mouth the bread turned into a *stone*, so that the had not patience to stay to receive the *Cup*. So very pittyful are the proofs, brought against the use of both kinds for a 1000. years after *Christ*; which being supposed and acknowledged, by some of the most learned and ingenuous of their own *Church*, I wonder what authority the *Church* afterwards can have to alter, what was always looked on before, as an obliging *Institution* of *Christ*? Might it not as well alter any other *Institution*, on the same grounds? and wholly forbid the bread to the Laity, as well as the cup; and I do not at all question, but as substantial reasons might be brought for one, as the other. I had thought, the *Gentlemen* of the *Roman Church* had pretended a mighty reverence to *Apostolical Traditions*, and the

Vindication of Arch-Bishop Laud. Part. 3. c 3. s. 14. 15. 16. 17.

Practice

Practice of the *Catholick Church*, for a *thousand* years after *Christ*. But it seems, this signifies nothing to them, when it is contrary to their present doctrine and practice. Then it makes *a great noise* as he saith, but nothing else: Thus we *Protestants* have at last gained *Antiquity* of our side, it is now yielded that though the *Church* were for us, for a *thousand* years, yet if it now decree or act otherwise, this is enough for them. And we are contented to have *Christ* and *his Apostles*, and all the *Primitive practice* for so long a time, on our side; and to leave them to enjoy the satisfaction that follows taking the part of the *Church* of *Rome*, against them all. But however *their opinion tends more to devotion?* Alas for us! we do not account it any piece of devotion to believe nonsense, and contradictions such as the doctrine of transubstantiation implies: we know not, what devotion there can be in opposing a plain Institution of *Christ*; and not meerly, in leaving the people at liberty to receive in one or both kinds, but in *prohibiting* the far greatest part of *Christians*, to receive as *Christ* appointed; we know not, what devotion there can lye in worshipping a piece of bread, for the *Son* of *God*; and believing, that when a wafer is taken into our mouths, *that God himself is personally entered under our Roof.* O horrible devotion, and detestable superstition! to give the same adoration to a *wafer*; which we do to the *Eternal God*; and to believe *Christ* to go down as personally into our bellies, as ever he went up and down when he was upon earth.

Of the Popes power of dispensing

§. 12. That which followes is, *the power of a Persons dispensing in oaths and marriages contrary to the Law of God*, which I therefore made a hindrance of the sincerity of devotion, because it is apt to possess mens minds with an apprehension that Religion is only a *Politick Cheat*, if any person shall be thought able to dispense with those things, which are universally received among *Christians* as the *Laws* of *God*. That which I meant, was the *Popes* taking upon him to dispense with *oaths* of *allegiance* to *Princes*, and the *incestuous marriages* of some great *Princes*. And now, let any one consider what his Answer signifies: he saith, *that some kinds of oaths may be judged in some circumstances to be hurtful, and not fit to be kept: and the dispensation in them is no more than to judge or determine them to be so: and for Marriages*, he addes that *the Church may dispense in some degrees of Affinity and consanguinity, but in nothing contrary to the Law of God.* But this doth not at all reach to the business; for dispensing in this way may as well be done by a *Casuist*, as the *Bishop* of *Rome*; but the Question lyes here, whether those things which otherwise would be sins by the Law of God, do therefore cease to be so, because of the *Popes* Power to discharge that obligation of conscience which lay upon the Person, either in oaths or marriages? Let him answer directly to this; for the other is shuffling, and not answering. As, it is granted that a subject hath an obligation of conscience upon him, to obey his Soveraigne by vertue of the *Law* of *God*;

and

and the universal sense of the *Church* hath been, that there are some degrees of consanguinity and Affinity which it is *Incest* to marry within: I desire to know, whether the *Popes* power can make disobedience *lawful*, in one case; and marriage, in another, which without that *Power* were utterly unlawful? This he could not but know was the thing meant, but not fit to be answered.

§. 13. The last Instance is, *making disobedience to the Church, in disputable matters, more hainous, than disobedience to the Laws of Christ, in unquestionable things, as marriage in a Priest, to be a greater crime than Fornication. To this he answers.* 1. *That the Law of the Church being supposed forbidding the marriage of a Priest, that is no disputable matter: but it is out of Question by the Law of God, that obedience is to be given to the commands or prohibitions of the Church.* 2. *That marriage in a Priest, the prohibition of the Church being supposed, and a voluntary vow against it, is no better than Adultery in the language of the Fathers, and therefore worse than Fornication.* 3. *That the state of single life is much more convenient for Priests, than the married state is.* This last answer, is nothing at all to the purpose; for in matters of conveniency, not determin'd by any Law, every one is left to be his own chooser, but the case I put, was not between a *married life* and *single life*; for we know no harm, either in one, or the other of these; but every one is to judge, as most tends to the comfort of his life, and the ends of his calling; which hath now far dif-

The ill consequence of asserting marriage in a Priest, to be worse than Fornication.

different circumstances, from the *Apostolical* times; which is a sufficient answer to the *Apostles* words, 1 *Cor.*7. 32. having a particular respect to the state of the *Christian Church*, in that time of unfixedness and persecution: but the opposition was between *marriage* in a *Priest*, and *Fornication*; whether the former were not by them made a greater crime, than the latter; and whether this were not dishonour to the *Laws* of *Christ*, to make the breach of a constitution of the *Church*, in a matter left at liberty by the *Law* of *Christ*, a greater crime, than the violation of an indisputable *Law* of his? And *S. Paul* hath given a general rule, which equally holds in all ages of the *Church*, *If they cannot contain let them marry, for it is better to marry than to burn.* So that if *S. Paul* may resolve the case he makes no question, that where there is but danger of *Fornication*, *marriage* is so far from being a greater crime than that, that it becomes a *duty* to such a one. *But hold*, say they of the Church of Rome to *S. Paul*, *this is only meant of those whom the Church allowes to marry, but if the Church once forbid it to any, they are not to marry, let their case be what it will.* Here then lyes the dispute between *S. Paul*, and them; *S. Paul* saith, *to avoid fornication a man ought to marry*; they say, that to marry, after the prohibition of the *Church*, is worse than Fornication: *S. Paul* might it may be ask, *what authority their Church had to determin contrary, to what he had done in this case*; *Or men to make vows*, against the most proper remedy

1 *Cor.*7 9.

remedy of ſome of the Infirmities of humane nature, and which *God* hath not promiſed to any to keep them from: If obedience to the *Church* be indiſputable, it is only in ſuch things, which *God* hath not antecedently determin'd by his own *Law*; but, in the caſe between *marriage* and *fornication*, *God* himſelf hath given a *Law* before hand, which no *Church* in the world can reverſe. And, however indifferent a thing in the general it be to marry or not, yet when it comes to that point, either *marriage* or *Fornication*, I wonder at the confidence of any, who dare upon any account whatſoever, make *marriage* a greater crime than *Fornication*.

But, he ſaith, *it ſeems ſtrange to them who either cannot or will not take the word of Chriſt, that is his counſel of chaſtity, that marriage in a Prieſt ſhould be a greater ſin than Fornication.* It doth, I aſſure you ſeem ſtrange to us, becauſe we are deſirous to keep the *Commands* of *Chriſt*; and we are ſure, *marriage* is againſt none of them, but *Fornication* is. Doth that man *take Chriſts counſel of chaſtity*, that rather chooſes to commit *Fornication*, than *marry?* What admirable *chaſtity* is that? and what a beaſtly inſtitution muſt marriage be, if *Fornication* be a leſs *crime* than that? But what a reflection is this, the mean while, on the *author* of it, and that *ſtate* of *innocency* and purity wherein it was firſt appointed: They muſt needs think themſelves very holy men, who look on that ſtate as too impure for them, which was allotted to man in his greateſt

In-

Innocency. But although the first *Ages* of the *Christian Church* were so full of hardship and difficulties, that if ever it should have been required of the *Governours* of the *Church* to have been above this *state*, it should have been at that time; yet we find no such thing in the *Apostolical* times, or afterwards; when the necessities of affairs would most have required it. But when the *Christian Church* came to have settlement in the world, and by degrees persons were fixed with endowments to particular places, and some care of affaires of the world was necessarily joyned with those of the *Church*; there was far less reason, to make such a prohibition of marriage to the *Clergy* than ever was before. And the *scandals* were so abominable, where those restraints were most in force, that on that very account, the wisest men (though as fond as any, of the *Churches* authority) thought there was more reason to give liberty to *Priests* to marry, than ever there had been to restrain them from it. I am not bound to defend all the extravagant and indiscreet passages, which fell from some of the *Fathers* concerning *marriage*, but I am sure the *Church* preserved her liberty in it, notwithstanding them; as I might easily prove, if it were suitable to my present designe. And

Cyprian. ep. 62. *S. Cyprian* speaking of those *Virgins*, who came nearest to vows of virginity, as *Rigaltius* observes, saith, *that it were better for them to marry, than to fall into hell by their sins; when they either will not, or cannot keep their promise*; the same thing is said, by *S. Augustin*, by *Epiphanius*

nius, by the author of the epistle *ad Demetriadem*, as *Bishop Jewel* hath long since proved; and need not here be repeated. *August. de San. Virginit. l. c 34. Epiph. c. hær. 61. Hieronym. ep. ad demetriad.*

Two things he objects, to prove marriage worse than fornication after a vow of continency; one from the authority of *S. Paul*, who saith *the younger Widdows that marry after the dedicating themselves to the service of the Church, doe incurre damnation; because, by so doing they made void their first faith, i. e. as the Fathers expound it, the vow they had made.* But doth he really think, that they did not *break their first faith* and *incurr damnation* by *Fornication*, as well as by *Marrying?* If they did, how can this prove *marriage* worse than *Fornication?* I grant, that by their *first faith* hath been understood the promise made to the *Church*; and who denies breach of promise, to be a bad and scandalous thing, which is that *S. Paul* means by *damnation*; and is not *Fornication* much more so, where a thing in it self evil is committed, besides the breach of the promise? Can any one think, that is not more *waxing wanton against Christ*, than meer *marrying* is? Therefore *S. Paul* would have *the younger Women to marry*, and not make any such promises, which they would be in danger of breaking; he would have none admitted into the condition of *Church-widdowes*, but those *that were 60. years of ages*, and so in reason to be supposed passed the temptations to *Fornication*. Whereby he shews what rule ought to be observed, in all such promises; and that none ought to be brought under them, but such as Jewels defense of the Apology *part. 2. p. 174.* 1 *Tim. 5. 14.* *v. 9.*

as are to be supposed past the common temptations of humane nature in those things. But his second authority is more to his purpose, (if it were good for any thing,) which is *the* 104. *Canon of the* 4. *Council of Carthage*, as it is called; but he might have found, in *Justellus* his preface to the *Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Africanæ*, that *this* 4. *Council of Carthage is of no Authority at all*; and we need not be concerned for any *Canon* contained therein, which is not in the *Code* of the *African Church*, as this is not; but seems taken out of some *Decretals* of the *Popes*, as will appear, by comparing the 101. *Canon* in the *Collection* of *Cresconius*, with the 104. of this *Council*. And it would be very strange, if *S. Augustin* were present in this *Council*, that he should herein oppose, what he had said elsewhere; for he determins, *that the marrying again of the widdows, that had vowed continuance in that state, was no Adultery, but a lawful marriage; and that husband and wife ought not to be separated from each other, upon such marriages, and by that means, make the husbands truely Adulterers, when they separate from them and marry other wives: and therefore*, saith he, *that which the Apostle condemns in them, is not so much their marrying as their will to marry, whether they do or no, whereby they break their first faith*; So that it is not *marriage*, but *lust* which the *Apostle* condemns; from whence it appears, that *S. Austin* could never, if he spake consonantly to himself, condemn *marriage* after a vow of continency, to be worse than *Fornication*. Indeed, he saith, that

*Bibliotheca juris Canonici. p.*317.

*August. de bono viduitat. c.*9.10. 11.

that this falling from that holy chaſtity which was vowed to God, may in ſome ſenſe be ſaid to be worſe than Adultery; but he never imagined ſuch a conſtruction could be made of his words, as though the act of *Fornication* were not a greater *falling from it*, than meer *marriage* could be.

So much ſhall ſuffice for the Inſtances produced in the *Roman Church*, of ſuch things which tend to obſtruct a good life and devotion.

Of the uncertainty of faith in the Roman Church.

§. 14. The 3. argument I uſed, to prove the danger a perſon runs of his *ſalvation* in the *communion* of the *Roman Church*, was, becauſe *it expoſeth the faith of Chriſtians to ſo great uncertainties*; which he looks *on as a ſtrange charge from the Pen of a Proteſtant*. As *ſtrange* as it is, I have at large proved it *true*, in a full examination of the whole Controverſie of the *Reſolution of faith* between us and them; to which I expect a particular Anſwer, before this charge be renewed again. To which I muſt refer him for the main proof of it, and ſhall here ſubjoyn only ſhort replyes to his Anſwers; or references to what is fully anſwered already.

Vindication of Arch-Biſhop Laud *part.* 1. *h.* 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.

1. His diſtinction, *of the authority of the Scripture in it ſelf and to us*, ſignifies nothing; for when we enquire into the proofs of the Authority of *Scripture*, it can be underſtood no otherwiſe than in reſpect *to us*; and if the *Scriptures Authority* as *to us*, is to be proved by the *Church*, and the *Churches Authority* as *to us*, to be proved by the *Scripture*, the

the difficulty is not in the least avoided by that distinction. And as little to the purpose is the other, *that it is only an argument ad hominem, to prove the Infallibility of the Church from Scriptures*; for I would fain know, upon what other grounds they build their own belief of the *Churches Infallibility*, than on the *Promises* of *Christ* in the *Scripture?* These are miserable evasions, and nothing else. For the trite saying of *S. Austin, that he would not believe the Gospel*, &c. I have at large proved, that the meaning of it is no more, than that the *Testimony* of the *Universal Church* from the *Apostles* times, is the best way to prove the particular books of *Scripture* to *be authentical*, and cannot be understood of the *Infallibility* of the *present Church*; and that the testimony of some few persons, as the *Manichees* were, was not to be taken, in opposition to the whole *Christian Church*. Which is a thing we as much contend for, as they; but is far enough from making the *Infallibility* of our faith, to depend on the *Authority* of the present *Church*; which we say is the way to overthrow all certainty of faith, to any considering man.

c. 7 sect. 9.

2. To that, of overthrowing the certainty of sense in the doctrine of *transubstantiation*; he saith, *that divine revelation ought to be believed against the evidence of sense*. To which I answer (1.) that divine revelation, in matters not capable of being judged by our *senses*, is to be believed, notwithstanding any argument can be drawn from sensible ex-

experiments againſt it, as in the belief of *God*, the doctrine of the *Trinity*, the future ſtate of the ſoul, *&c.* (2.) that in the proper objects of ſenſe, to ſuppoſe a *Revelation* contrary to the evidence of ſenſe, is to overthrow all certainty of faith, where the matters to be believed depend upon matters of fact. As for Inſtance, the truth of the whole *Chriſtian doctrine* depends upon the truth of *Chriſts* reſurrection from the dead: if ſenſe be not here to be believed in a proper object of it, what aſſurance can we have that the *Apoſtles* were not deceived, when they ſaid they ſaw *Chriſt* after he was riſen?

If it be ſaid, *there was no revelation againſt ſenſe in that caſe*: that doth not take off the difficulty, for the reaſon why I am to believe *revelation* at any time againſt ſenſe muſt be, becauſe ſenſe may be deceived, but revelation cannot; but if I yield to that principle, that ſenſe may be deceived in its moſt proper object, we can have no infallible certainty by ſenſe at all, and conſequently not in that point, that *Chriſt* is riſen from the dead. If it be ſaid, *that ſenſe cannot be deceived, where there is no revelation againſt it*: I deſire to know how it comes to be deceived, ſuppoſing a revelation contrary to it? Doth *God* impoſe upon our ſenſes, at that time? then he plainly deceives us; is it by telling us, we ought to believe more than we ſee? that we deny not, but we deſire only to believe according to our ſenſes, in what we do ſee; as that what we ſee to be bread, is bread; that what the *Apoſtles* ſaw to

be the body of *Christ*, was the *body* of *Christ* really, and substantially, and not meerly the accidents of a body. Besides, if revelation is to be believed against sense; then either that revelation is conveyed immediately to our minds, which is to make every one a Prophet that believes transubstantiation; or mediately by our senses, as in those words *this is my body*: if so, than I am to believe this revelation by my senses, and believing this revelation, I am not to believe my senses: which is an excellent way of making faith certain. All this on supposition there were a revelation in this case, which is not only false, but if it were true would overthrow the certainty of faith.

3. To What I objected, as to their denying to men the use of their judgement and reason as to the matters of faith proposed by a Church, when they must use it in the choice of a Church, he answers, *that this cannot expose faith to any uncertainty, because it is only preferring the Churches judgement before our own*: but he doth not seem to understand the force of my objection, which lay in this. Every one must use his own judgement and reason, in the choice of the *Church* he is to rely upon; is he certain in this or not? if he be uncertain, all that he receives on the *Authority* of that *Church*, must be uncertain too: if the use of reason be certain, then how comes the *Authority* of a *Church* to be a necessary means of certainty in matters of faith? And they, who condemn the use of a mans reason and judgement in *Religion*, must overthrow all certainty on their own grounds;

since

since the choice of his *Infallible Guide* must depend upon it. Now that he understands my argument better, he may know better how to answer it: but I assure him I meant no such thing by the use of reason, *as he supposes I would have, which is to believe nothing, but what my reason can comprehend*; for I believe an Infinite Being, and all the Doctrines revealed by it in *Holy Scriptures*, although I cannot reconcile all particulars concerning them to those conceptions we call reason. But therefore to argue against the use of mens judgements in matters of faith, and the grounds of believing, is to dispute against that, which all wise men ever did, and will do to the worlds end.

4. I proved, they made faith uncertain, by making the *Churches* power to extend to the making new articles of faith. This he grants *to be to the purpose, if it were true: but* he saith, *the Church never owned any such power in her General Councils*, (which doth not hinder but that the *Heads* of their *Church* have pretended to it, and in case it be disputable among them, whether the *Pope* be not *infallible*, that unavoidably leaves faith at uncertainties.) Yet he yields what I contend for, which is, *that it is in the Churches Power, to make that necessary to be believed, which was not so before*: for whether it be *by inventing new Articles*, or *declaring more explicitely the Truths not contained in Scripture and Tradition*, it is all one to my purpose; as long as men might be saved without believing them before, and cannot afterwards; which

is to make the conditions of salvation *mutable*, according to the pleasure of the *Church*, which is the greatest inconveniency of inventing *new doctrines*.

5. I shewed, they made faith uncertain by pretending to infallibility in determining Controversies, and yet not using it to determine those which are on foot among themselves. The force of the argument did not lye in this as he imagines, *as though faith could not be certain, unless all controversies were determined*, which was far from my thoughts; but, that pretending there can be no faith without *infallibility* in their *Church* to end Controversies, they should give such great occasion to suspect that they did not believe themselves by not imploying that *Infallibility* in ending the great Controversies among themselves; of which I have spoken already, and to this he gives no answer at all.

Thus much in Vindication of the third Argument, I made use of to prove, that all those who are in the Communion of the *Roman Church*, do run so great a hazard of their salvation, that none who have a care of their souls ought to embrace or continue in it.

The case of a revolter, and a bred Papist, compared.

§. 15. I now come to the third answer to the first Question, which was, *that a Protestant leaving the Communion of our Church, doth incurre a greater guilt, than one who was bred up in the communion of the Church of* Rome, *and continues therein by invincible Ignorance, and therefore cannot equally be saved with such a one.* Three things he objects against this Answer.

1. *That this makes them both damned, though une-*

unequally; becauſe the Converted Catholick more deeply, than he that was bred ſo. 2. *That this reflects as much upon St.* Auſtin *as them, who rejected the Communion of the* Manichees, *and embraced that of the Church of* Rome *upon their grounds.* 3. *That it is contrary to our diſtinction, of points fundamental and not fundamental.* To which I Reply.

1. That the deſign of my Anſwer was not, to paſs the ſentence of damnation on all who dye in the communion of the *Roman Church*; but to ſhew, that they who forſook a *better Church* for it do *incurre greater guilt*, than thoſe who are alwayes *bred up* in it, and live and dye in the belief of its being the *true Church*; and therefore, are not in an *equal capacity of ſalvation* with them. I ſhall make my meaning more plain, by a parallel Inſtance or two; many in the *Church* of *Rome* have aſſerted the poſſibility of the *Salvation* of *Heathens* (though ſome *Bigots* have denyed it to *Proteſtants*) ſuppoſe this queſtion were put, concerning two perſons: *Whether a Chriſtian, having the ſame motives to become a Heathen, which one bred and born and well grounded in Heatheniſm hath to remain in it, may not equally be ſaved in the profeſſion of it?* and a third perſon ſhould anſwer, *that a Chriſtian, leaving the communion of the Chriſtian Church, doth incurre a greater guilt, than one who was bred up in Heatheniſm, and continues therein by invincible Ignorance:* doth this anſwer imply, that they *muſt both be damned though equally?* or rather, doth it not yield a greater poſſibility of ſalva-

tion to one than to the other? Or suppose, (to come nearer our case) the question were put, concerning one that *revolted* from the *Church of Judah* to the *ten Tribes*, (which were guilty of *Idolatry*, though not of the highest kind,) whether he were equally capable of salvation with one, who was *bred up* in the communion of the *Church* of *Israel* all his dayes? I should make no question, to pronounce his condition more dangerous than the other; and yet not therein *damn them both*, but only imply that it was much harder for one to escape than the other. For he that was bred up in the *Church* of *Israel*, believing it was the true *God* he served, and in a right manner, and looking on the *Church* of *Judah* as a *Schismatical Church*, and seeing the greater number of Tribes on their side, and wanting that instruction which was in the *Church of Judah*, might in the sincerity of his heart serve *God* in a false way, and pray to him to pardon all his errours and corruptions, and have a general repentance of all sins, though not particularly convinced of the *Idolatry* of the *ten Tribes*, I dare not say, but *God* will accept of such a one, *that thus fears God and works Righteousness* in the simplicity of his heart: but I cannot say the same, of one who revolts from *Judah*; where the *true God* was worshipped in a *true manner*; where he had sufficient means of instruction, and either wilful Ignorance, or temporal ends, or unreasonable prejudices makes him deliberately choose a worse and more impure *Church* before a better; for that very sin makes his case much more dangerous, than the other.

other. Our buſineſs it not, to enquire into the *ſalvation* or *damnation* of any *particular perſons*; for that depends upon ſo many circumſtances, as to the aggravation or extenuation of their, faults, the nature and ſincerity of their repentance, the integrity and ſimplicity of their minds; which none but *God* himſelf can know: but to find out the *trueſt way to ſalvation*, and to reject whatever *Church* requires that which is in it ſelf ſinful; for though *God* may pardon thoſe who live in it in the ſimplicity of their minds, yet their hopes lying in their *Ignorance* and *repentance*, none who have a care of their ſouls dare venture themſelves in ſo hazardous a ſtate. Setting aſide then the conſideration of the danger common to both, I ſay the caſe of a *Revolter* from us to the *Church* of *Rome* is much worſe, than of one who was alwayes bred up in it; becauſe he might far more eaſily underſtand the danger he runs into, and wilful *Ignorance* only keeps him from it, and he doth upon deliberation chooſe a ſtate of infinite hazard before one of the greateſt ſafety.

2. This doth not reflect on St. *Auſtin* or the *Church* in his time, which was as far different from theirs, as the *Churches* of *Judah* and *Iſrael* were from each other: neither can it deſtroy the *diſtinction*, *of Fundamentals and not Fundamentals*, for the *poſſibility* of *ſalvation* allowed to any in their *Church*, is built upon the ſuppoſition that they have all that is *fundamentally neceſſary* in order to it, though there are many dangerous errours and corruptions in that

Church whose communion they live in.

The motives of the Roman Church considered.

§. 16. The Answers to the first Question being thus vindicated; there remains little to be added concerning the second. For he tells me, *that he agrees so far with me, that every Christian is bound to choose the communion of the purest Church. But which that Church is, must be seen by the grounds it brings to prove the doctrines it teaches, to have been delivered by Christ and his Apostles.* And to be even with him, I thus far agree with him, in the way of proof of a *Churches purity*, *viz.* by agreement with the doctrine of *Christ* and his *Apostles*; and that that Church is to be judged purest, which shews the greatest evidence of that consent; and *that every one is bound to enquire, which Church hath the strongest Motives for it, and to embrace the communion of it.*

Being thus far agreed, I must now enquire into what *motives* he offers on behalf of their *Church*, and what method he prescribes for delivering *ours*. For the former, he produces *a large Catalogue of Catholick Motives* (as he calls them) *in the words of Dr.* Taylour, *Liberty of Prophecy, Sect.* 20. And I do not know a better way of answering them, than in the words of the same eminent and learned Person, which he uses upon a like occasion to his demonstrating Friend *J. S.*

Preface to the second part of his dissuasive.

"But now in my Conscience, (saith the *Bishop*) "this was unkindly done, that when I had "spoken for them what I could, and more "than I knew they had ever said for themselves, and yet to save them harmless from "the iron hands of a tyrant and unreasonable "power,

" power, to keep them from being perſecut-
" ed for their errours and opinions, that they
" ſhould take the arms I had lent them for
" their defence, and throw them at my head.
" But the beſt of it is, though *J. S.* be unthank-
" ful, yet the Weapons themſelves are but
" wooden Daggers, intended only to repre-
" ſent, how the poor men are couzened by
" themſelves; and that under fair and fraudu-
" lent pretences even pious well meaning men,
" men wiſe enough in other things, may be
" abuſed. And though what I ſaid, was but
" tinſel and pretence, imagery and whipt
" Cream, yet I could not be blamed to uſe no
" better than the beſt their cauſe could bear:
" yet if that be the beſt they have to ſay for
" themſelves, their probabilities will be ſoon
" out-ballanced by one Scripture-teſtimony ur-
" ged by Proteſtants, and *thou ſhalt not Worſhip*
" *any graven Images* will out-weigh all the beſt
" and faireſt imaginations of their Church.——
" But then *J. S.* might, if he had pleaſed, have
" conſidered, that I did not intend to make that
" harangue, to repreſent that the Roman Reli-
" gion had probabilities of being true, but pro-
" babilities that the Religion might be tolera-
" ted, or might be endured: and if I was de-
" ceived, it was but a well meant errour, here-
" after they ſhall ſpeak for themſelves; only for
" their comfort, this they might have alſo ob-
" ſerved in that Book, that there is not half ſo
" much excuſe for the Papiſts, as there is for the
" Anabaptiſts, and yet it was but an excuſe at
" the beſt. But ſince from me, ſaith he, they bor-

" row

"row their light Armour, which is not "Piſtol-proof, from me if they pleaſe they "may borrow a remedy to undeceive them, "and that in the ſame kind and way of ar- "guing; for which he referrs to a letter writ- ten by him to a Gentlewoman, ſeduced to the *Church* of *Rome*; out of which I ſhall tranſcribe ſo much as as may over-ballance the probabilities produced elſewhere by him.

Polemical diſcourſes p. 705. &c. "After directions given, rather to enquire "what her *Religion* is than what her *Church* "is, for that which is a true *Religion* to day, "will be ſo to morrow and for ever; but that "which is a holy *Church* to day, may be He- "retical at the next change, or may betray "her truſt, or obtrude new Articles in con- "tradiction to the old, *&c.* and ſhewing the unreaſonablneſs of believing the Roman to be the Catholick Church; he deſcends thus to particulars. "You are now gone to a "Church that protects it ſelf by arts of ſub- "tlety and arms, by violence and perſecu- "ting all that are not of their minds: to a "Church, in which you are to be a ſubject "of the King, ſo long as it pleaſes the Pope: "In which you may be abſolved from your "Vows made to God, your Oaths to the "King, your Promiſes to Men, your Duty "to your Parents in ſome caſes: a Church "in which men Pray to God and to Saints, "in the ſame Form of words in which they "Pray to God; as you may ſee in the Of- "fices of Saints, and particularly of our La- "dy; a Church in which men are taught, by "moſt

" moſt of the principal Leaders, to Worſhip
" Images with the ſame Worſhip with which
" they Worſhip God or Chriſt, or him or her,
" whoſe Image it is, and in which they uſual-
" ly picture God the Father and the Holy
" Trinity, to the great diſhonour of that Sa-
" cred myſtery, againſt the doctrine and pra-
" ctice of the primitive Church, againſt the
" expreſs doctrine of Scripture, againſt the
" honour of a divine Attribute; I mean the
" immenſity, and ſpirituality of the divine
" nature: You are gone to a Church, that
" pretends to be infallible, and yet is infi-
" nitely deceived in many particulars, and yet
" endures no contradiction, and is impatient
" her Children ſhould enquire into any thing
" her Prieſts obtrude. You are gone from
" receiving the whole Sacrament, to receive
" it but half; from Chriſts Inſtitution, to a
" human Invention; from Scripture, to un-
" certain Traditions; and from ancient Tra-
" dition, to new pretences; from Prayers
" which ye underſtood, to Prayers which ye
" underſtand not; from confidence in God, to
" rely upon Creatures; from intire dependance
" upon inward acts, to a dangerous tempta-
" tion of reſting too much in outward mini-
" ſteries, in the external work of Sacraments
" and Sacramentals. You are gone from a
" Church, whoſe Worſhipping is ſimple, Chri-
" ſtian, and Apoſtolical, to a Church where
" mens Conſciences are loaden with a burden
" of Ceremonies, greater than that in the dayes
" of the Jewiſh Religion (for the Ceremonial

of

"of the Church of *Rome* is a great Book in "Folio.) You are gone from a Church, were "you were exhorted to read the Word of "God, the Holy Scriptures, from whence you "found instruction, institution, comfort, re-"proof, a treasure of all excellencies, to a "Church that seals up that Fountain from "you, and gives you drink by drops, out of "such Cisterns as they first make, and then "stain, and then reach out: and if it be told "you, that some men abuse Scripture, it is "true; for if your Priests had not abused Scrip-"ture, they could not thus have abused you;) "but there is no necessity they should, and "you need not unless you list; any more "than you need to abuse the Sacrament; or "Decrees of the Church, or the messages of "your friend, or the Letters you receive, or "the Laws of the Land, all which are lyable "to be abused by evil persons, but not by good "people and modest understandings. It is "now become a part of your Religion, to be "Ignorant, to walk in blindness, to believe "the man that hears your Confessions, to hear "none but him, not to hear God speaking but "by him, and so you are lyable to be abus-"ed by him, as he please, without remedy. "You are gone from us, where you are only "taught to worship God through Jesus Christ,) "and now you are taught to Worship Saints "and Angels, with a Worship at least dan-"gerous and in some things proper to God; "for your Church Worships the *V. Mary* with "burning Incense and Candles to her, and

you

" you give her preſents which by the conſent
" of all Nations uſed to be eſteemed a Worſhip
" peculiar to God, and it is the ſame thing
" which was condemned in the *Collyridians*,
" who offered a Cake to the *V. Mary*. A Can-
" dle and a Cake make no difference in the
" Worſhip; and your joyning God and the
" Saints, is like the device of them that fought
" for King and Parliament; the latter deſtroys
" the former. To which he ſubjoynes, that
" the points of difference, between us and the
" Church of *Rome*, are ſuch as do evidently ſerve
" the ends of Covetouſneſs and Ambition in
" them: and that very many of her Doctrines
" are very ill Friends to a good life, and that
" our Religion is incomparably beyond theirs
" in point of ſafety: as in point of Praying to
" God alone, and without Images, relying
" on God as infallible, which are ſurely law-
" ful; but it is at leaſt hugely diſputable,
" and not at all certain, that any man or ſocie-
" ty of men can be infallible, that we may put
" our truſt in Saints, or Worſhip Images, &c.
" From whence he concludes; So that unleſs
" you mean to preferr a danger before ſafety,
" temptation to unholineſs before a ſevere and
" holy Religion; unleſs you mean to loſe the
" benefit of your prayers, by praying what
" you perceive not, and the benefit of the Sacra-
" ment in great degrees, by falling from Chriſts
" Inſtitution, and taking half inſtead of all;
" unleſs you deſire to provoke God to jealou-
" ſie by Images, and man to jealouſie in profeſ-
" ſing a Religion, in which you may in many

" caſes

"cases have leave to forfeit your faith and "lawful trust; unless you will choose a Ca- "techism without the second Commandment, "and a faith that grows bigger or lesser as "men please, and a hope that in many de- "grees relyes on men and vain confidences, and "a Charity that damns all the world but your "selves, unless you will do all this, that is, "suffer an abuse in your Prayers, in the Sa- "crament, in the commandments, in faith, "in hope, in Charity, in the Communion of "Saints, and your duty to your Supream, you "must return to the bosome of your Mother "the Church of *England*, and I doubt not "but you will find the comfort of it in all "your life, and in the day of your death, and "in the day of Judgement.

Thus far that excellent person, and I leave you now to judge between the Motives on both sides, as they are laid down by him whom my Adversary appeals to; and I must thank him for the kindness of mentioning him against me, without which I had wanted so good a representation of the Motives of either side, and so full an Answer to the pretences brought for the *Church* of *Rome*. The other Motives which he adds of *Fathers*, *Councils* and *Tradition*, he knows are utterly denyed by us; and I wonder he should insist upon them, since in the matters of our debate, *Antiquity* is so evidently of our side, as against Worship of Images and Saints, against Purgatory, Transubstantiation, Prayers in an unknown tongue; and he thinks it no great matter to allow us

a thous-

a thousand years againſt communion in one kind, and yet all this while *Scripture*, *Fathers*, *Councils*, and *Tradition* are all on their ſide. For the *teſtimony of the preſent Church*; we deny that *S. Auſtin* ſpeaks of it, as of it ſelf ſufficient; and though he did, that concerns not the *Roman Church*, any more than other parts of the *Catholick Church*; and he may aſſoon prove *Tyber* to be the *Ocean*, or *S. Peters* at *Rome* to have been before the *Temple* at *Hieruſalem*, as prove the *Roman Church* to be the *Catholick Church*, or the *Mother* of all *others*.

The faith of Proteſtants reduced to Principles.

§. 17. But I muſt conclude, with *the method he preſcribes to you* for ſatisfaction from me; which is *not to meddle with particular diſputes*, (which we know very well the reaſon of) *but to call upon me for a Catalogue of our grounds, and to bring things to Grounds and Principles* (as they have learnt to Cant of late) *and then*, he ſaith, *Controverſie will ſoon be at an end.* I ſhould be glad to ſee it ſo; notwithſtanding his Friend *J. S.* accounts it ſo *noble a Science*, unleſs he hath changed his mind, ſince for ſo many years now, he hath failed in the *Defence* of his *Demonſtrations*. But to ſatisfie the *men* of *Principles*, and to let them ſee we can do more *than find fault with their Religion*, I ſhall give an account of the *faith* of *Proteſtants* in the way of *Principles*; and of the reaſon of our rejecting their impoſitions, which is all we can underſtand by *Negative Points*; and if we can give an account of the *Chriſtian faith*, independently on their *Churches Authority* and *Infallibility*, it evidently follows,

follows, that cannot be the *foundation* of faith; and so we may be very *good Christians*, without having any thing to do with the *Church* of *Rome*. And I know no other Answer necessary, not only to this present demand, but to a Book called *Protestants without Principles*, the falsity of which will appear by what follows.

Principle

Principles Agreed, on both sides.

1. THat there is a *God*, from whom man, and all other Creatures had their Being.

2. That the notion of God doth imply, that he is a Being absolutely perfect, and therefore Justice, Goodness, Wisdom, and Truth must be in him, to the highest degree of perfection.

3. That man receiving his Being from God, is thereby bound to obey his will; and consequently, is lyable to punishment in case of disobedience.

4. That in order to mans obeying the will of God, it is necessary that he know what it is; for which, some manifestation of the will of God is necessary; both that man may know what he hath to do, and that God may justly punish him, if he do it not.

5. Whatever God reveals to man is infallibly true, and being intended for the rule of mans obedience may be certainly known to be his Will.

6. God cannot act contrary to those essential Attributes of Justice, Wisdom, Goodness and Truth, in any way which he makes choice of, to make known his will unto man by.

Theſe things being agreed on both ſides, we are now to inquire, into the particular ways which God hath made choice of, for revealing his will to mankind.

1. AN entire obedience to the will of God being agreed, to be the condition of mans happineſs, no other way of Revelation is in it ſelf neceſſary to that end, than ſuch whereby man may know what the will of God is.

2. Man being framed a rational Creature, capable of reflecting upon himſelf, may antecedently to any external Revelation certainly know the Being of God, and his dependance upon him, and thoſe things which are naturally pleaſing unto him; elſe there could be no ſuch thing as a Law of Nature, or any principles of Natural Religion.

3. All ſupernatural and external Revelation, muſt ſuppoſe the truth of natural Religion; for unleſs we be antecedently certain, that there is a God, and that we are capable of knowing him, it is impoſſible to be certain, that God hath revealed his will to us by any ſupernatural means.

4. Nothing ought to be admitted for Divine Revelation, which overthrows the certainty of thoſe Principles which muſt be antecedently ſuppoſed to all Divine Revelation.

For

For that were to overthrow the means, whereby we are to Judge concerning the truth of any Divine Revelation.

5. There can be no other means imagined, whereby we are to judge of the truth of Divine Revelation, but a Faculty in us of diſcerning truth and falſhood, in matters propoſed to our belief; which if we do not exerciſe in Judging the truth of Divine Revelation, we muſt be impoſed upon by every thing which pretends to be ſo.

6. The pretence of Infallibilty, in any perſon or Society of men, muſt be Judged in the ſame way, that the truth of a Divine Revelation is; for that Infallibility being challenged by vertue of a ſupernatural aſſiſtance, and for that end, to aſſure men what the will of God is, the ſame means muſt be uſed for the trial of that, as for any other ſupernatural way of Gods making known his Will to men.

7. It being in the power of God, to make choice of ſeveral wayes of revealing his will to us, we ought not to diſpute from the Attributes of God the neceſſity of one particular way, to the Excluſion of all others; but we ought to enquire, what way God himſelf hath choſen: and whatever he hath done, we are ſure cannot be repugnant to Infinite Juſtice, Wiſdome, Goodneſs, and Truth.

8. Whatever way, is capable of certainly conveying the will of God to us, may be made choice of by him for the means of

making known his will, in order to the happineſs of mankind; ſo that no Argument can be ſufficient *a priori* to prove, that God cannot chooſe any particular way to reveal his mind by, but ſuch which evidently proves the inſufficiency of that means for conveying the Will of God to us.

9. There are ſeveral wayes conceivable by us, how God may make known his Will to us; either by immediate voice from Heaven, or inward inſpiration to every particular perſon, or inſpiring ſome to ſpeak perſonally to others, or aſſiſting them with an infallible ſpirit in Writing ſuch Books, which ſhall contain the Will of God for the Benefit of diſtant Perſons and future Ages.

10. If the Will of God cannot be ſufficiently declared to men by Writing, it muſt either be, becauſe no Writing can be intelligible enough for that end, or that it can never be known to be Written by men infalliby aſſiſted; the former is repugnant to common ſenſe, for words are equally capable of being underſtood, ſpoken, or written; the latter overthrows the poſſibility of the Scriptures being known to be the Word of God.

11. It is agreed among all Chriſtians, that although *God* in the firſt Ages of the World did reveal his mind to men immediately by a voice or ſecret inſpirations; yet afterwards he did communicate his mind to ſome immediately inſpired to Write his

his Will, in Books to be preſerved for the benefit of future Ages; and particularly, that theſe Books of the New Teſtament which we now Receive were ſo Written, by the Apoſtles and Diſciples of Jeſus Chriſt.

12. Such Writings having been received by the *Chriſtian* Church of the firſt Ages as Divine and Infallible, and being delivered down as ſuch to us, by an univerſal conſent of all Ages ſince, they ought to be owned by us as the certain rule of faith; whereby we are to Judge, what the Will of God is in order to our Salvation; unleſs it appear, with an evidence equal to that whereby we believe thoſe Books to be the Word of God, that they were never intended for that end, becauſe of their obſcurity or imperfection.

13. Although we cannot argue againſt any particular way of Revelation, from the neceſſary Attributes of God; yet ſuch a way as writing being made choice of by him, we may juſtly ſay, that it is repugnant to the nature of the deſign, and the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God to give infallible aſſurance to perſons in Writing his Will, for the benefit of Mankind, if thoſe Writings may not be underſtood by all perſons, who ſincerely endeavour to know the meaning of them, in all ſuch things as are neceſſary for their ſalvation.

14. To ſuppoſe the Books ſo Written to be imperfect, *i. e.* that any things neceſſary to be believed or practiſed are not contained in them, is either to charge

the first Author of them with fraud, and not delivering his whole mind, or the Writers with insincerity in not setting it down, and the whole Christian Church of the first Ages with folly, in believing the Fulness and Perfection of the Scriptures, in order to Salvation.

15. These Writings being owned, as containing in them the whole Will of God, so plainly revealed, that no sober enquirer can miss of what is necessary for salvation; there can be no necessity supposed of any infallible society of men, either to attest, or explain these Writings among Christians; any more, than there was for some Ages before *Christ*, of such a Body of men among the *Jews*, to attest or explain to them the Writings of *Moses* or the *Prophets*.

16. There can be no more intolerable usurpation upon the faith of *Christians*; than for any Person or Society of men, to pretend to an assistance, as infallible in what they propose, as was in *Christ* or his *Apostles*, without giving an equal degree of evidence, that they are so assisted; as *Christ* and his *Apostles* did, *viz.* by *miracles* as great, publick, and convincing as theirs were; by which I mean, such as are wrought by those very persons who challenge this infallibility, and with a design for the conviction of those who do not believe it.

17. Nothing can be more absurd, than to pretend the necessity of such an infallible commission and assistance, to assure us of the truth of these writings, and to interpret them,

and

and at the same time to prove that commission from those writings, from which we are told nothing can be certainly deduced, such an assistance not being supposed; or to pretend, that infallibility in a body of men, is not as lyable to doubts and disputes, as in those books from whence only they derive their infallibility.

18. There can be no hazard to any person, in mistaking the meaning of any particular place in those books, supposing he use the best means for understanding them, comparable to that which every one runs, who believes any person or society of men to be infallible, who are not: for in this latter, he runs unavoidably into one great errour, and by that may be led into a thousand; but in the former, God hath promised either he shall not erre, or he shall not be damned for it.

19. The assistance which God hath promised to those, who sincerely desire to know his will, may give them greater assurance of the truth of what is contained in the Books of Scripture, than it is possible for the greatest infallibility in any other persons to do, supposing they have not such assurance of their infallibility.

20. No mans faith can therefore be infallible, meerly because the Proponent is said to be infallible; because the nature of *Assent* doth not depend, upon the objective infallibility of any thing without us, but is agreeable to the evidence we have of it in our minds; for assent is not built on the nature of things, but their evidence to us.

21. It is therefore neceſſary in order to an infallible aſſent, that every particular perſon be infallibly aſſiſted in Judging of the matters propoſed to him to be believed; ſo that the ground, on which a neceſſity of ſome external infallible Proponent is aſſerted, muſt rather make every particular perſon infallible, if no divine faith can be without an infallible aſſent, and ſo renders any other infallibility uſeleſs.

22. If no particular perſon be infallible, in the aſſent he gives to matters propoſed by others to him; then no man can be infallibly ſure, that the Church is infallible; and ſo the Churches infalliblity can ſignifie nothing to our infallible aſſurance, without an equal infallibility in our ſelves in the belief of it.

23. The infallibility of every particular perſon being not aſſerted by thoſe, who plead for the infallibility of a Church, and the one rendring the other uſeleſs (for if every perſon be infallible, what need any repreſentative Church to be ſo) and the infallibility of a Church being of no effect, if every perſon be not infallible in the belief of it; we are farther to inquire, what certainty men may have in matters of faith, ſuppoſing no external proponent to be infallible.

24. There are different degrees of certainty to be attained, according to the different degrees of evidence, and meaſure of divine aſſiſtance; but every Chriſtian, by the uſe of his reaſon, and common helps of Grace, may attain to ſo great a degree of certainty, from the

the convincing argument of the Christian Religion and authority of the Scriptures, that on the same grounds, on which men doubt of the truth of them, they may as well doubt of the truth of those things which they Judge to be most evident, to sense or reason.

25. No man, who firmly assents to any thing as true, can at the same time entertain any suspition of the falshood of it; for that were to make him, certain and uncertain of the same thing: it is therefore absurd to say, that those who are certain of what they believe, may at the same time not know but it may be false; which is an apparent contradiction, and overthrows any faculty in us of judging of truth or falshood.

26. Whatever necessarily proves a thing to be true, doth at the same time prove it impossible to be false; because it is impossible the same thing should be true and false, at the same time. Therefore they, who assent firmly to the doctrine of the Gospel as true, do thereby declare their belief of the Impossibility of the falshood of it.

27. The nature of certainty doth receive several names, either according to the nature of the proof or the degrees of the assent. Thus *moral certainty* may be so called, either as it is opposed to *Mathematical evidence*, but implying a firm assent upon the highest evidence, that Mortal things can receive: or as it is opposed to a higher degree of certainty, in the same kind; so Moral certainty implies only

only greater *probabilities* of one side than the other; in the former sense, we assert the *certainty* of Christian faith to be *moral*, but not only in the latter.

28. A Christian being thus certain to the highest degree of a firm assent, that the Scriptures are the word of God, his faith is thereby resolved into the Scriptures, as into the rule and measure of what he is to believe; as it is into the veracity of God, as the ground of his believing what is therein contained.

29. No Christian can be obliged under any pretence of infallibility, to believe any thing as a matter of faith, but what was revealed by God himself, in that Book wherein he believes his will to be contained; and consequently he is bound to reject, whatsoever is offered to be imposed upon his faith, which hath no foundation in Scripture, or is contrary thereto; which rejection, is no making *Negative Articles of faith*, but only applying the general grounds of faith to particular instances; as, because I believe nothing necessary to salvation, but what is contained in Scripture, therefore no such particular things which neither are there nor can be deduced thence.

30. There can be no better way, to prevent mens mistakes in the sense of Scripture, (which men being fallible are subject to) than the considering the consequence of mistaking, in a matter wherein their salvation is concerned: and there can be no sufficient reason given, why that may not serve in matters of faith, which God himself hath made use of, as the means

means to keep men from ſin in their lives: unleſs any imagine, that errors in opinion are far more dangerous to mens ſouls than a vitious life is; and therefore that God is bound to take more care to prevent the one, than the other.

It followeth that,

1. There is no neceſſity at all, or uſe, of an infallible Society of men, to aſſure men of the truth of thoſe things, which they may be certain of without it; and cannot have any greater aſſurance, ſuppoſing ſuch infallibility to be in them.

2. The infallibility of that Society of men, who call themſelves the Catholick Church, muſt be examined by the ſame faculties in man, the ſame rules of tryal, the ſame motives, by which the infallibility of any divine revelation is.

3. The leſs convincing the miracles, the more doubtful the marks, the more obſcure the ſenſe of, either what is called the Catholick Church, or declared by it, the leſs reaſon hath any Chriſtian, to believe upon the account of any, who call themſelves by the name of the *Catholick Church.*

4. The more abſurd any opinions are, and repugnant to the firſt principles of ſenſe and reaſon, which any *Church* obtrudes upon the faith of men; the greater reaſon men ſtill have, to reject the pretence of infallibility in that Church, as a grand impoſture.

5. To

5. To diſown, what is ſo taught by ſuch a Church, is not to queſtion the veracity of God, but ſo firmly to adhere to it, as to what he hath revealed in Scriptures, that men dare not out of love to their ſouls reject what is ſo taught.

6. Though nothing were to be believed as the will of God, but what is by the Catholick Church declared to be ſo; yet this doth not at all concern the *Church* of *Rome*, which neither is the *Catholick Church*, nor any ſound part or member of it. This may ſuffice, to ſhew the validity of the principles, on which the faith of Proteſtants ſtands, and the weakneſs of thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome*.

From all which it followes, that it can be nothing but willful Ignorance, weakneſs of Judgement, ſtrength of prejudice, or ſome ſinful paſſion, *which makes any one* forſake the Communion of the Church of England, to embrace that of the Church of *Rome*.

FINIS.

Books Printed for, and sold by Henry Mortlock, *at the* Phœnix *in S.* Pauls Church-Yard, *and at the* White Heart, *in* Westminster-Hall.

A Rational account of the grounds of Protestant Religion, being a vindication of the Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury*'s Relation of a Conference, *&c.* From the pretended Answer of *T. C.* by *Edward Stillingfleet* D. D. *Folio.*

Observations upon Millitary and Political affairs, written by the most honourable *George* Duke of *Albemarle*, and published by Authority. *Fo.*

Irenicum, A weapon salve for the Churches wounds, or the Divine right of Forms of Church government Examined and Discussed. *Quarto.*

Origines Sacræ; Or a Rational account of the grounds of Christian Faith, as to the Truth and Divine Authority of the Scriptures, and the matters therein contained: both by *Edward Stillingfleet*, D .D. *Quarto.*

Knowledge and Practice, or a plain Discourse of the Chief things, necessary to be *known, believed*

ved and *practized* in order to ſalvation, by *S. Cradock*, neceſſary for all Families. *Quarto.*

A Sermon Preached before the KING, *January* 30. 1668. by *Edward Stilingfleet*, D. D. *Quarto.*

Six Sermons, with a Diſcourſe annext concerning the true Reaſon of the Sufferings of Chriſt, wherein *Crellius* his Anſwer to *Grotius* is conſidered by *Edward Stillingfleet*, D. D. in *Octavo.*

The Being and Well-being of a Chriſtian, in three Treatiſes, the firſt ſetting forth the proper Profit of the Righteous: the ſecond, The Excellency of Grace: the Third, The Nature and Sweetneſs of Fellowſhip with Chriſt; by *Edward Reyner* late Miniſter at *Lincoln*, publiſhed by his ſon *I Reyner. Octavo.*

The Triumphs of *Rome* over deſpiſed Proteſtancy, by Biſhop *Hall. Octavo.*

The Moral Philoſophy of the *Stoicks. Octavo.*

A Fathers Teſtament, written long ſince for the Benefit of the particular Relation of the Author *Phin. Fletcher. Octavo.*

The advice of *Charles* the fifth Emperour of *Germany*, and King of *Spain*; to his Son *Phillip* the ſecond, upon his reſignation of the Crown of *Spain*, to his ſaid Son. in *Twelves.*

FINIS.